



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive
DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations

1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

2010-03

CPO leadership : unique and innovative
leadership characteristics of senior enlisted
that sustain Naval operations

Juergens, Jason M.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/5371>

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

CPO LEADERSHIP: UNIQUE AND INNOVATIVE
LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF SENIOR ENLISTED
THAT SUSTAIN NAVAL OPERATIONS

by

Jason Michael Juergens

March 2010

Thesis Co-Advisors:

Alice Crawford
Neal Thornberry

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE March 2010	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE CPO Leadership: Unique and Innovative Leadership Characteristics of Senior Enlisted that Sustain Naval Operations.			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Jason M.Juergens				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government. IRB Protocol Number _NPS. 2010.0005-IR-EP7-A_				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) United States Navy officers and enlisted personnel have always recognized the unique power and capability of the senior enlisted community that binds these groups together and is integral to the success of Navy operations. Yet, little has been systematically written about the leadership characteristics of this group that make them so vital to the Navy. This study examines senior enlisted leadership in the U.S. Navy, focusing on the unique community of master chief petty officers. Data were attained through in-depth interviews of 19 master chief participants who were identified as particularly successful. Results identify characteristics of the chief petty officer (CPO) that are common to all good leaders, but also characteristics that are unique to this group. For example, the camaraderie of the Chief's Mess provides the CPO Mess immense power, Navy-wide. A philosophy of "command first, person second" is widely endorsed, which creates the ultimate team experience, led by the Command Master Chief. The master chief's unique and innovative characteristics will be critical in sustaining Naval operations in the course of leading the Millennials into the 21st century. Further research on senior enlisted leadership is suggested.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Manpower; Recruiting; Retention; Personnel/Attrition; Special Studies; Training; Leadership			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 135	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**CPO LEADERSHIP: UNIQUE AND INNOVATIVE LEADERSHIP
CHARACTERISTICS OF SENIOR ENLISTED THAT SUSTAIN NAVAL
OPERATIONS**

Jason M. Juergens
Lieutenant, United States Navy
MBA, Ohio Dominican University, 2008
B.S., Miami University-Ohio, 1997

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 2010**

Author: Jason M. Juergens

Approved by: Alice M. Crawford
Co-Advisor

Neal E. Thornberry
Co-Advisor

William R. Gates
Dean, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

United States Navy officers and enlisted personnel have always recognized the unique power and capability of the senior enlisted community that binds these groups together and is integral to the success of Navy operations. Yet, little has been systematically written about the leadership characteristics of this group that make them so vital to the Navy. This study examines senior enlisted leadership in the U.S. Navy, focusing on the unique community of master chief petty officers. Data were attained through in-depth interviews of 19 master chief participants who were identified as particularly successful. Results identify characteristics of the chief petty officer (CPO) that are common to all good leaders, but also characteristics that are unique to this group. For example, the camaraderie of the Chief's Mess provides the CPO Mess immense power, Navy-wide. A philosophy of "command first, person second" is widely endorsed, which creates the ultimate team experience, led by the Command Master Chief. The master chief's unique and innovative characteristics will be critical in sustaining Naval operations in the course of leading the Millennials into the 21st century. Further research on senior enlisted leadership is suggested.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	OVERVIEW.....	1
B.	PURPOSE.....	2
C.	METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY.....	2
1.	Methodology.....	2
2.	Scope.....	3
D.	BENEFITS OF THE STUDY.....	4
E.	ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS.....	4
II.	METHODOLOGY.....	5
A.	OVERVIEW.....	5
B.	INTERVIEWS.....	6
1.	Sampling Plan.....	6
2.	Structure and Focus of Interviews.....	7
3.	Limitations.....	8
4.	Summary of Methodology and Preview of the CPO History.....	9
III.	CHIEF PETTY OFFICER HISTORY AND BACKGROUND.....	11
A.	EARLY BEGINNINGS.....	11
1.	The Early Years of the United States and the United States Navy.....	11
2.	History of the Chief Petty Officer Rank and Development of Rank Structure.....	13
3.	Development of Compensation System (Pay Grade).....	21
4.	Establishment of Master Chief and Senior Chief Petty Officer	22
5.	Brief History on Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy (MCPON).....	23
B.	NAVY RATINGS.....	24
1.	Ratings.....	24
2.	Ratings of the Participants in This Study.....	25
C.	PRESENT DAY MASTER CHIEF PETTY OFFICER.....	27
1.	Mission.....	27
2.	Vision.....	27
3.	Guiding Principles.....	28
D.	SUMMARY OF CPO HISTORY AND PREVIEW OF EARNING THE GOLD FOUL ANCHORS.....	28
IV.	OVERVIEW OF EARNING THE GOLD FOUL ANCHORS.....	31
A.	CAREER PATH.....	31
1.	Progressing Through the Ranks.....	31
2.	CPO Board Selection Process.....	32
a.	General Board Information.....	33
b.	Board Process.....	34
3.	Continuation Boards.....	36

4.	Evaluations	38
B.	TRAINING AND EDUCATION	40
1.	Leadership Training	40
2.	Senior Enlisted Academy	42
C.	CONCLUSION OF EARNING THE GOLD FOUL ANCHORS.....	43
V.	RESULTS	45
A.	OVERVIEW	45
B.	THEMES	45
1.	Mission First–Sailors Are Always Imperative to Sustain Naval Operations	45
2.	The Chief Petty Officer (CPO) Is the Lynchpin That Binds the Officer and Enlisted Ranks.....	46
3.	The Importance of the CPO Mess Cannot Be Understated.....	47
4.	Chief Petty Officers Are Ultimate Team Builders Who Train and Develop the Ranks of Today for the Future of the Navy	48
5.	Mastering the Realm of Expertise Will Lead to Credibility and Success Through Experience and Walking the Walk.....	49
6.	Smell Like a Sailor and Impart Through Nose-to-Nose Leadership	52
7.	Vision, Communication, and Relationship Building Are Paramount to Leading a Strong Command	53
8.	Innovation and the Vision to Accept Change Will Aid in Adapting to the 21st Century Navy	54
9.	Leading Up, Down, and Laterally Are Expected as a CPO	55
a.	<i>Leading Up</i>	55
b.	<i>Leading Down</i>	57
c.	<i>Leading Laterally</i>	59
C.	SUMMARIZING THE RESULTS.....	60
VI.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	61
A.	SUMMARY	61
1.	Command First, Person Second	61
2.	The CPO Mess Is the Core of the Navy	61
3.	Deck-Plate Leaders	62
4.	Experience and Age Lead to Seasoned Leaders.....	62
B.	CONCLUSION	63
1.	Future Challenges for Leadership.....	63
2.	Recruiting and Leading the Millennials	64
C.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	66
1.	Creation of the E-10 Pay Grade	66
2.	Education on the Uniqueness of the CPO.....	67
3.	Future Research	67
D.	FINAL REMARKS.....	68
	APPENDIX A. MASTER CHIEF DIROSA’S CREDENTIALS	69
	APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW FORMAT AND QUESTIONS.....	71

APPENDIX C. 1893 RATING BADGES AND INSIGNIA FOR CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS	73
APPENDIX D. CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF OCTOBER 1949	75
APPENDIX E. INSIGNIA OF MASTER CHIEF PETTY OF THE NAVY (MCPON).....	79
APPENDIX F. CHRONOLOGY OF MASTER CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS OF THE NAVY (MCPON).....	81
APPENDIX G. MCPON LEADERSHIP MESS (FLEET, FORCE, AND COMMAND MASTER CHIEFS).....	83
APPENDIX H. OCCUPATIONAL FIELDS AND ASSOCIATED RATINGS.....	87
APPENDIX I. ENLISTED RATINGS.....	89
APPENDIX J. NAVY ENLISTED MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION.....	93
APPENDIX K. FITNESS REPORT (FITREP)	95
APPENDIX L. E-7 THRU E-9 EVALUATION AND COUNSELING RECORD (CHIEFEVAL)	97
APPENDIX M. NAVADMIN 176/08	99
APPENDIX N. CHIEF PETTY OFFICER CREED.....	101
APPENDIX O. EVALUATION REPORT AND COUNSELING RECORD (E-1 THROUGH E-6) - NAVPERS 1616/26	103
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	105
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	111

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	General Order No. 409.....	19
Figure 2.	U.S. Navy Regulation Circular No. 1	20

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Organization of Study	4
Table 2.	Interview Participants	5
Table 3.	Definitions of Rate and Rank.....	11
Table 4.	Manning for Original Six Frigates.....	13
Table 5.	U.S. Navy Regulations Circular No. 41.....	16
Table 6.	Enlisted Pay Grades and Titles	21
Table 7.	Navy Rating Categories	25
Table 8.	List of Current Rate and Former Ratings Representing Participants.....	26
Table 9.	CPO Guiding Principles.....	28
Table 10.	Navy Enlisted Minimum Requirements for Promotion.....	31
Table 11.	Factors for Candidates Eligible for E-7 Promotion	36
Table 12.	FITREP and CHIEFEVAL Differences.....	39

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Aviation Boatswain's Mate (ABE - Equipment; ABF - Fuel; ABH - Handling)
AC	Air-Traffic Controller
AD	Aviation Machinist's Mate
ADM	Admiral
AE	Aviation Electrician's Mate
AG	Aerographer's Mate
AM	Aviation Structural Mechanic (AME - Equipment)
AN	Airman
AO	Aviation Ordnance Man
AS	Aviation Support Equipment Technician
AT	Aviation Electronics Technician
AVF	All-Volunteer Force
AW	Naval Air Crewmen
AZ	Aviation Maintenance Administration Man
BM	Boatswain's Mate
BT	Boiler Technician
BU	Builder
BUMED	Bureau of Medicine
BUPERS	Bureau of Naval Personnel
CBT	Computer-based Training
CE	Construction Electrician
CHIEFEVAL	Chief Evaluation (E-7 thru E-9 Evaluation and Counseling record)
CM	Construction Mechanic
CMC	Command Master Chief
CMT	Chief's Mess Training
CMDCM	Command Master Chief
CNO	Chief of Naval Operations
CNP	Chief of Naval Personnel
CO	Commanding Officer

COB	Chief of the Boat
COBLC	Chief of the Boat Leadership Course
CPO	Chief Petty Officer
CPOS LC	Chief Petty Officer Selectee Leadership Course
CPPD	Center for Personal and Professional Development
CS	Culinary Specialist
CSC	Command Senior Chief
CT	Cryptologic Technician (CTM - Maintenance; CTT - Technical)
CTI	Cryptologic Technician (Interpretive)
CTN	Cryptologic Technician (Networks)
CTR	Cryptologic Technician (Collection)
DC	Damage Controlman
DIVO	Division Officer
DOD	Department of Defense
EA	Engineering Aide
EM	Electrician's Mate
EN	Engineman
EO	Equipment Operator
EOD	Explosive Ordnance Disposal
ET	Electronics Technician
ETCS	Senior Chief Electronics Technician
ET NUC	Electronics Technician (Nuclear)
F	Female
FC	Fire Control Man
FITREP	Fitness Report
FLTCM	Fleet Master Chief
FN	Fireman
FO	Flag Officer
FORCM	Force Master Chief
FT	Fire Control Technician
GM	Gunner's Mate
GO	General Officer

GS	Gas Turbine System Technician (GSE - Electrical; GSM - Mechanical)
HM	Hospital Corpsman
HT	Hull Maintenance Technician
HYT	High-year Tenure
IA	Individual Augmentee
IC	Interior Communications Electrician
IS	Intelligence Specialist
IT	Information Systems Technician
LCS	Littoral Combat Ship
LN	Legal Man
LCPO	Leading Chief Petty Officer
LPO	Leading Petty Officer
LS	Logistics Specialist
M	Male
MA	Master-at-Arms
MC	Mass Communication Specialist
MC1	Mass Communication Specialist First Class
MC2	Mass Communication Specialist Second Class
MCC	Chief Mass Communication Specialist
MCCS	Senior Chief Mass Communication Specialist
MCPO	Master Chief Petty Officer
MCPOC	Master Chief Petty Officers of the Command
MCPON	Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy
MDV	Master Diver
MILPERSMAN	Military Personnel Manual
MM	Machinist Mate (Surface)
MN	Mineman
MR	Machinery Repairman
MT	Missile Technician
MU	Musician
NAVADMIN	Naval Administrative Message

NAVMAC	Navy Manpower Analysis Center
NAVPERS	Naval Personnel
NC	Navy Counselor
ND	Navy Diver
NEC	Navy Enlisted Classification Codes
NETC	Naval Education and Training Command
NIOC	Navy Information Operations Command Suitland
NJP	Non-Judicial Punishment
NKO	Navy Knowledge Online
NPC	Navy Personnel Command
NRD	Navy Recruiting District
OPNAVINST	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction
OS	Operations Specialist
PC	Postal Clerk
PFA	Physical Fitness Assessment
PO1	Petty Officer First Class
PO1SLC	Petty Officer First Class Selectee Leadership Course
PO2	Petty Officer Second Class
PO2SLC	Petty Officer Second Class Selectee Leadership Course
PO3	Petty Officer Third Class
POS LC	Petty Officer Selectee Leadership Course
PR	Aircrew Survival Equipment Man
PS	Personnel Specialist
PTS	Perform to Serve
QM	Quartermaster
ROAD	Retired on Active Duty
RP	Religious Programs Specialist
RTC	Recruit Training Command
SB	Special Warfare Boat Operator
SCPO	Senior Chief Petty Officer
SEA	Senior Enlisted Academy
SEAC	Senior Enlisted Academy Course

SECB	Senior Enlisted Continuation Boards
SECNAV	Secretary of the Navy
SG	Surgeon General
SH	Ship's Serviceman
SK	Storekeeper
SN	Seaman
SO	Special Warfare Operator
ST	Sonar Technician (STG - Surface; STS - Submarine)
SW	Steelworker
TAFMS	Total Active Federal Military Service
TIG	Time-in-Grade
U.S.	United States
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USFF	US Fleet Forces Command
USN	United States Navy
UT	Utilities Man
VADM	Vice Admiral
WCS	Work Center Supervisor
WCSLC	Work Center Supervisor Leadership Course
XO	Executive Officer
YN	Yeoman
YNCM	Master Chief Yeoman
YOS	Years of Service

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my wife, Nicole, and daughter, Gabrianna, for their support, patience, and encouragement while writing this study. Without their understanding and sacrifice, preparing this study would have been impossible. I would also like to thank my parents, Joseph and Joanne, for their never-ending support, for instilling moral principles in me to press on and accomplish more than I ever thought I could, and for being excellent parents. I also thank my step-father; Doug—your sincere interest and intellect have challenged me more than you know. To the rest of my brothers and sisters, thank you, and I miss you all. I also thank Mr. and Mrs. Chris Zevallos for your assistance and continued support in my Naval career.

I would be remiss if I did not mention Command Master Chief Jacqueline DiRosa. You are an incredible individual and the support and access you gave me to the Navy's best and brightest senior enlisted leaders only enriched this study and my personal education on leadership. Thank you. The 19 master chief petty officers who participated—you all are a wealth of knowledge and contributed significantly to this study. Thank you for being generous with your time and feedback, as well as your honorable service.

I would like to thank the past and present courageous men and women of our Armed Forces that have truly paved the way for this privilege and the freedoms our nation has each day.

I would like to thank my thesis advisors, Professor Alice Crawford and Professor Neal Thornberry, for your help and guidance while writing this study. You both kept me focused and made this experience extremely rewarding. Thank you, Ms. Mary Lou Vossen, for your assistance with my interviews and the resources you gave me to conduct them. Finally, thank you, Ms. Donna Cuadrez, for your editing and many questions you answered.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

"If your actions inspire others to dream more, learn more, do more and become more, you are a leader." - John Quincy Adams

A. OVERVIEW

Highly effective leadership is essential in the Navy's ability to adapt through 230 years of change, threats, and the ability to sustain the world's greatest Navy. The United States Navy has been blessed with top-notch enlisted leadership. This leadership, in particular the rank of chief petty officer to master chief petty officer, has been the "glue" to the world's most dominating Navy for nearly 117 years.

One of the greatest challenges for the Navy since its inception has been to remain a principal force during numerous conflicts and threats. By and far, America has responded without question to any and all threats that have jeopardized the freedom and principles upon which this nation was built. The Navy has been led through these times by men and women who have embraced the challenge of leadership with a "can do" attitude, resulting in sustained freedom and superior performance.

Leadership from the deck-plates up has been as essential for the Navy as middle management for Ford Motor Company. The blue collar chief has led and will continue to lead through his or her actions, by mentoring young enlisted men and women, while training junior Naval officers, and by correcting the senior officer, when no else wants to put his or her neck on the line. This is the foundation on which the Navy's leadership was built.

As the military changes in response to the changing environment, leadership must remain flexible and willing to lead different personalities and often times different generational mentalities through extremely adverse conditions. The Navy has groomed the chief petty officer to fulfill this complex duty in a wide variety of ways. As chiefs develop into senior chiefs, then master chiefs, they become highly skilled in leading and displaying leadership skills that are quite unique and valuable. The master chief, in many instances, becomes a consummate professional at leading up, down, and laterally.

The most common thread to any naval operation are the chief petty officers. They have lived it, seen it, slept it and, most importantly, learned from past successes and failures. This experience is invaluable and part of the career progression of a chief petty officer. These experiences are vital and aid in the development of the talent pool within the chief petty officer community. To fully understand enlisted leadership one must understand the driving force behind the blue collar Navy, the master chief petty officer. This thesis will explore the leadership techniques of chief petty officers and the challenges posed for their leadership in the future.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this research is to examine enlisted leadership with a focus on master chief petty officers and their leadership methods. The goal is to understand key leadership characteristics used to complement behaviors that are frequently observed within highly effective senior enlisted leaders, and how they actually get the job done as the enlisted leaders of the United States Navy.

C. METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1. Methodology

The methodology used in this thesis research will consist of the following steps:

- Conduct a thorough review of enlisted naval leadership practices.
- Conduct a literature search of books, magazine articles, CD-ROM systems, and other library information resources to determine the approach of this study based on past literature and/or studies that have been the focus of senior enlisted leadership in the U.S. Navy.
- Conduct in-depth interviews with selected master chief petty officers to determine their leadership characteristics and how these characteristics will contribute to future success with the challenges ahead. The interview process will also target two administrators who are familiar with the chief petty officer selection process (these administrators may come from the

participants). The target population sample will be roughly 25 (if definitive patterns develop after 10–15 interviews, the interview process may be halted). The selected group will be handpicked by an experienced master chief who has the experience and position to identify high performing master chiefs.

- The interview process will attempt to extract key variables such as observed characteristics that complement behaviors, which are unique to this group of leaders and that have been inherently vital to the relationship between enlisted leadership and the officer community.

2. Scope

The scope of this study will include:

- Two assumptions: Command Master Chief Jacqueline DiRosa has over 28 years of naval service, including over 10 years as a command master chief, and has the distinct designation of being the first enlisted woman selected for both force and fleet master chief, among other accomplishments. This study is fortunate to have Command Master Chief DiRosa as the primary source for identifying “highly effective” senior enlisted leaders. The second assumption is that master chief petty officers are highly effective senior enlisted leaders. Making this assumption is relatively safe; being that one percent of the U.S. Navy’s enlisted end strength attains the rank of master chief petty officer.
- The limitations of this study will come from interview participants. The interviews will focus solely on master chiefs (E-9 pay grade). These limitations are necessary to focus the study on high quality master chiefs with superior leadership characteristics. This will establish a benchmark for best practices. By utilizing an “expert” to select the sample size this will generate more accurate results. This does introduce bias; however, this seems to be the most logical manner to obtain a representative sample.

D. BENEFITS OF THE STUDY

This study will provide keen insight into the leadership methods of master chief petty officers. More specifically, the study will establish key leadership characteristics that are frequently observed within highly effective senior enlisted leaders. This research will solidify why master chiefs are the “glue” to the core of naval leadership. It will serve as a study for future chiefs and officers to reference, providing leadership tools and insight from the elite of the elite. Additionally, the research will provide insight into future challenges for this cadre of Navy leaders.

E. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This thesis contains seven chapters; the remaining six chapters are briefly described in Table 1.

Table 1. Organization of Study

Chapter	Brief Summary
II	Addresses the methodology utilized to conduct the study, which will include the structure and focus of interviews, along with limitations of the study.
III	Presents the chief petty officer history and background related to the early beginnings, development of the rank structure, information on the Navy’s ratings, and concludes with the mission, vision, and guiding principles of today’s chief petty officer.
IV	Presents a review of previous studies related to senior enlisted leadership, leadership in general, and leadership in regards to civil counterparts.
V	Delves into the process of how one becomes a chief petty officer. This chapter reviews the career path of a CPO, including selection process, evaluations, and the training and education that most indoctrinated CPOs attain once they don the coveted gold foul anchors.
VI	Describes the results of an in-depth interview process that identifies the leadership characteristics of a highly effective senior enlisted leader.
VII	Provides a summary of this study, offers conclusions, and provides recommendations.

II. METHODOLOGY

“The price of greatness is responsibility.”
– Winston Churchill

A. OVERVIEW

This section of the study provides a thorough understanding of the methodology that was utilized to collect and analyze data on senior enlisted leadership. The data were generated through in-depth interviews with selected master chief petty officers to determine their leadership characteristics and how these characteristics will contribute to the future success of senior enlisted leadership with the challenges ahead. Interviews were conducted with one individual at a time, and lasted approximately one hour per interviewee. All interviewees were guaranteed anonymity in their responses and were told that they would receive a summary of the thesis results. The interview process also targeted two administrators who are familiar with the chief petty officer selection process, and five retired chief petty officers, to gain their perspective on civilian versus military chain of command and leadership. The target population sample resulted in 17 active duty master chiefs and two retired master chiefs. Table 2 illustrates the selected group that was handpicked by a master chief who has the experience and position to identify high performing master chiefs. The total number of years in the Navy amongst the participants, tallied over 504 years and 144 years at the rank of Master Chief Petty Officer (MCPO).

Table 2. Interview Participants

Current Rate	Rating Prior to CMDCM	Years in Navy	Years as CMC or Master Chief	Active Duty (AD) or Retired	Male or Female
GSCM	GS	27	10 as MC	AD	M
CMDCM	ET NUC	29	9 as CMC	AD	M
CMDCM	YN	26	2 as CMC	AD	M
FTCM	FT	30	9 as MC	Retired	M
CMDCM	AM	26	8 as MC	AD	M
HMC	HM	28	8 as MC	AD	M
CMDCM	FC	30	10 as CMC	AD	M
CMDCM	SK	24	5 as CMC	AD	M
CMDCM	HM	28	11 as CMC	AD	F

Current Rate	Rating Prior to CMDCM	Years in Navy	Years as CMC or Master Chief	Active Duty (AD) or Retired	Male or Female
CTRCM	CTR	28	9 as MC	AD	M
CMDCM	EN	30	12 as MC	AD	M
NCCM	NC	22	7 as MC	AD	F
CTNCM	CTN	18	1 as MC	AD	M
CMDCM	YN	24	3 as CMC	AD	F
CMDCM	CTI	23	6 as CMC	AD	M
NDCM	ND	29	6 as MC	AD	M
FORCM	HM	30	11 as MC	AD	F
FLTCM	SK	27	12 as MC	AD	M
ETCM	ET NUC	25	5 as MC	Retired	M

Note: All years are estimated rounded to closest year

The interview process was designed to extract key variables such as observed characteristics that complement effective leadership behaviors, which are unique to this group and that have been inherently vital to the relationship between enlisted leadership and the officer community. While this methodology utilized qualitative measures, the author believes that these “real” life examples will provide useful insights into understanding how and why these particular senior enlisted leaders have been effective and will aid in shaping the Navy’s future leaders.

B. INTERVIEWS

1. Sampling Plan

The sampling plan was rather straightforward; find “high quality” master chief petty officers who have shown effective leadership methods. Finding “high quality” master chiefs is somewhat of a nonsensical term, as approximately one percent of the U.S. Navy’s enlisted end strength can call themselves a master chief. That, in and of itself, is rarified company. As of December 2009, there were 2,613 active duty master chief petty officers (MCPOs), along with 200 plus reserve MCPOs. The total is estimated to be around 2,800 master chief petty officers in the Navy. Of these 2,800 MCPOs, there are approximately 750 Command Master Chief (CMC/CMDCM) billets, which include Force Master Chiefs (FORCM), Fleet Master Chiefs (FLTCM), and Chief of the Boats (COB) for both active and reserve units.

As previously mentioned, Master Chief Jacqueline DiRosa was instrumental in identifying the participants of this study. She is currently the Command Master Chief for Navy Information Operations Command (NIOC) Suitland. Refer to Appendix A for a detailed explanation on Master Chief DiRosa's background and credentials.

The next step was convincing the potential participants that this study was viable and worthwhile. Once the initial e-mail was sent out by the author, there was great support and, honestly, no compelling story was required, just an abundance of support to assist with the study. As participants were identified, the author devised a schedule to conduct the one-on-one interviews.

All interviews were conducted via telephone, with one exception. Each interview was audio recorded and backed up with handwritten notes by the author. The interviews were designed to be approximately 45 minutes to one hour; many went longer as the participants had an enormous amount of knowledge and experience to impart for the greater good of the study.

2. Structure and Focus of Interviews

The structure and focus of the interviews was developed over several iterations. The author and advisors did two "simulated" interviews before launching the first official interview. The purpose was to test out different questions and procedures, along with initiating the author into interview protocol and various tactics to make the interviews more effective. After concluding the initial test interviews, the recommendations were to proceed with interview themes to streamline the various aspects of senior enlisted leadership. The primary themes that were the focus of the study included: background (summary of career and billets held), courses (leadership courses), leadership (main focus of interview), industry analog (equivalent to CMC in civilian sector), career development, and future challenges (CPO and big Navy). Dividing the interview into different themes allowed for each section to be addressed separately, while compiling accurate and credible data for the end product. Appendix B shows the format and questions that were asked during each interview. An important note, not all questions were asked to each participant due to time constraints.

3. Limitations

The limitations of this study result from the interviewees. The limitations the interviewees bring to the study are the particular backgrounds or lack thereof associated with each individual participant. When the author made a request to Master Chief DiRosa to assist with this study, he recommended a diverse group of master chiefs with various ratings and experiences. Fortunately, CMC DiRosa was able to deliver a diverse possible list of participants. Actual participation was up to each individual notified of the study via e-mail. There was no coercion or monetary incentive, just the opportunity to impart knowledge to a shipmate and allow those that participated in the study to critically think about senior enlisted leadership.

The possible initial interview pool from Master Chief DiRosa was 28. Two of the participants gave the author five more potential interviewees, plus the author used two MCPOs from another source, and one from one of the advisors of this study, bringing the total number of possible participants to 36. Of the 36, 22 replied with either a “yes” or “if you need me, I can help” response, leaving 14 non-respondents. The author concluded the study after 19 participants had been interviewed. The author felt there were enough data and the participants had diverse experiences, totaling over 504 years and over 144 at the rank of MCPO. Refer to Table 2 for a more detailed listing, previously in this chapter.

The interviews focused solely on master chiefs (E-9 pay grade). The intent was to acquire data on experienced CPOs to enrich this study, which the E-9 pay grade does. The master chief has been through the process and experiences of being an E-7 (Chief Petty Officer) and E-8 (Senior Chief Petty Officer). Master Chiefs bring a unique experience of leadership, and they certainly have earned the right to be called master chief. As stated earlier, they make up less than one percent of the enlisted ranks. With this said, master chiefs, do not always demonstrate superior leadership skills, but it is a rather safe assumption that the participants in this study have been successful leaders as the majority of them have been either a Fleet, Force, or Command Master Chief or a Chief of the Boat.

CMDCM boards are held annually while FLTCMs/FORCMs and other "Flag-Level" CMCs are selected based on a package review and interview. All Flag-Level CMC assignments (approximately 100) are filled by Flag/General Officer selection usually after eligible CMC candidates submit a package for consideration to the requesting Commander. Selection is ideally based on candidate leadership experience, career success, and "fit" to the assignment and selecting Commander. Each of these positions is highly scrutinized and held in very high esteem and is attained based on being a peak performer and leader during one's career. Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction (OPNAVINST) 1306.2E provides an explanation of the expectations and why strong leadership for FLTCMs, FORCMs, CMDCMs, and COBs is essential in the introduction of OPNAVINST 1306.2E, as stated below.

Fleet Master Chiefs (FLTCMs), Force Master Chiefs (FORCMs), Command Master Chiefs (CMDCMs), Command Senior Chiefs (CSCs) and Chiefs of the Boat (COB) provide leadership to the enlisted force and advise Commanders/Commanding Officers on enlisted matters that support mission accomplishment. They uphold and enforce the highest standards of professionalism, integrity and enhance active communication at all levels of command throughout the Department of the Navy.

FLTCMs, FORCMs, CMDCMs, CSC and COBs report directly to their respective Commanders/Commanding Officers. They advise their respective Commander/Commanding Officer and assist in the formulation, implementation and execution of policies concerning morale, welfare, job satisfaction, discipline, utilization and training of enlisted Sailors. (OPNAVINST 1306.2E section A, para. 1 and 2, 2008)

4. Summary of Methodology and Preview of the CPO History

This chapter pointed out the methodology along with the details to ensure a strong qualitative study would result from the interviews and research. The ensuing chapter will give a thorough understanding of the history of the CPO, ratings, and will conclude with the CPO Guiding Principles and why they are essential to today's senior enlisted leadership.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. CHIEF PETTY OFFICER HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

*“A leader is one who knows the way, shows the way, and goes the way.”
- Author Unknown*

For the purpose of this study, and in particular Chapter III, rate and rank will be defined according to Table 3.

Table 3. Definitions of Rate and Rank

Rank – refers to pay grade (i.e., E-1 through E-9 for purposes of this study).
Rate – identifies the enlisted persons field of expertise and pay grade combined (i.e., Gunner’s Mate First Class).
Rating – identifies the enlisted persons field of expertise, only applies to petty officers, E-4 and above (i.e., ET (Electronics Technician), BM (Boatswain’s Mate)).
The official definition recorded in the <i>The Bluejacket’s Manual</i> is explained as follows: Traditionally, the term “rank” was applied only to officer pay grades, and the term “rate” was used to describe the enlisted pay grades. In more recent times, this distinction has become less clear-cut, and enlisted pay grades are sometimes referred to as ranks as well. The term “rate” really has two meanings. Like “rank,” it is roughly equivalent to pay grade, and is often used that way. For example, “Seaman Apprentice” or “Petty Officer Third Class” are rates. But rate is also often considered a combination of pay grade and rating. Remember that rating refers to an occupation and only applies to petty officers (E-4s and above). If someone referred to you as a “radioman,” they would be identifying you by your rating. But if they called you a “radioman second class,” they would be referring to your rate (your occupation and your pay grade combined). This is somewhat confusing, but you can stay out of trouble if you remember that rating <i>always</i> refers to occupation and rate involves pay grade. (2002, p. 48)

A. EARLY BEGINNINGS

1. The Early Years of the United States and the United States Navy

The United States of America was discovered, as a result of colonies that fought and successfully won a war for independence. These men discovered America as a result of navigating sea-going vessels for opportunity in the late fifteenth century. America claimed her independence from Britain on July 4, 1776. Prior to the United States officially becoming a nation, the Continental Congress established the Continental Navy (known as the United States Navy today) on October 13, 1775. As a result, “the Continental Congress authorized the outfitting of a ten-gun warship “for intercepting

such transports as may be laden with stores for the enemy” (Cutler, 2002, p. 555). The birth of the Continental Navy showed great foresight by the forefathers of America, launching, what today is the most powerful Navy the world has known, the United States Navy.

The U.S. Navy has revolutionized over its 234 years of existence. By no means has the U.S. Navy always prevailed. This impressive organization has persevered through highs and lows not always meeting the challenge of the enemy, but rarely, if ever without resolve and tireless determination to prove its valor and unrelenting dedication to her country and its people to maintain freedom and democracy. Through the face of adversity and tenacious leadership, the history of the United States Navy has been written in blood for the betterment of the future of the United States of America.

The first major step to establishing a naval armament was the passing of the Naval Act of 1794. This Act was developed in response to Thomas Jefferson urging Congress to re-establish an American naval force to ensure protection of American passage through the Mediterranean. This was in response to 13 merchant ships being captured by Algiers from 1785 to 1793 (11 of which occurred in 1793). Algiers and France were seizing goods and supplies from American ships, thus a plan to construct a more formal Navy was designed. However, following the Revolutionary War in 1785, Congress sold the last remaining American ship in the Continental Navy, USS *Alliance*. The United States was unable to support a Navy due to insufficient funds, mainly as a result of being a young nation with vast financial responsibilities. From 1785 to 1797, the only armed maritime support available to America was the United States Revenue Cutter Service, which was founded in 1790 under the direction of Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton. The United States Revenue Cutter Service later merged with the United States Life-Saving Service to form the United States Coast Guard (USCG) in 1915.

Protecting the United States and preserving her independence is an immense and expensive task not only today as a world power, but this was also true during the United States’ infant stages, over 200 years ago. America’s early leaders were finding out that it was imperative that America have a formidable Navy if they wanted to continue to grow and develop as a prosperous nation. The Naval Act of 1794 provided the following:

Nine brief sections which (1) authorized six ships, (2, 3, 4) set the numbers, grades, and ratings of officers and men, (5) gave the President his choice of buying or building the ships, (6, 7, 8) laid out the details of pay and rations, and (9) provided for the suspension of the Act upon negotiation of peace with Algiers. The preamble said the Act was for the purpose of protecting commerce from the Barbary powers. (Smelser, p. 11, 1958)

This Act outlined the ships, manning, weapons, and capital needed to re-establish a Navy for America's defense that would eventually become known as the United States Navy.

2. History of the Chief Petty Officer Rank and Development of Rank Structure

Chief Petty Officer has been an "official" rank for nearly 117 of the 234 years, essentially half of the existence of the U.S. Navy, including most of the "New Navy" and "Modern Navy" eras (1880–present). In the early years of the Navy, men were paid based on their value; there was no classification that designated sailors as particular ranks. Upon the completion of the ships that were built as a result of the Naval Act of 1794, the manpower levels were determined for the two classes of warships. Continental Congress wanted six ships that would fall under two class types, they were as follows: four 44 gun frigates and two 36 gun frigates. The personnel that were targeted for duty on these six frigates were largely accountable for the early rates and ranks of the U.S. Navy. The numbers varied between the two classes of ships, mainly due to the required manpower to ensure full operational status. The manning strategy for the original six frigates is best summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Manning for Original Six Frigates

	<u>44 Gun Frigates</u>	<u>36 Gun Frigates</u>
<u>Personnel</u>		
Captain	1	1
Petty Officers (appointed by Captain)	See below under Petty Officers.	See below under Petty Officers.
Non-petty Officers (Ordinary Seamen)	103 ^a	90
(Midshipmen)	103 ^a	130 ^b
(Able Seaman)	150	130 ^b
Marines (Sergeants)	3	2
(Corporals)	3	2

	<u>44 Gun Frigates</u>	<u>36 Gun Frigates</u>
(Privates)	50	40
<u>Petty Officers</u>		
Clerk	1	1
Boatswain's Mate	2	2
Coxswain	1	1
Sailmaker's Mate	1	1
Gunner's Mate	2	2
Yeoman of the Gun Room	1	1
Quarter Gunners	11	9
Carpenter's Mate	2	2
Armorer	1	1
<u>Petty Officers</u>		
Steward	1	1
Cooper	1	1
Master-at-Arms	1	1
Cook	1	1
Marines		
(Drummer)	1	1
(Fifer)	1	1

^aIndicates total number of Ordinary Seaman and Midshipmen equal 103 for 44 gun frigates. ^bIndicates total number of Midshipmen and Able Seaman equal 130 for 36 gun frigates. Adapted from "Naval History and Heritage website," by Lester B. Tucker, 1993.

The first attempt to establish the precedence of petty officers in the Navy was instituted in 1853 under the U.S. Navy Regulations. Initially, the regulations were approved by the President on February 15, 1853, but were eventually revoked by the Attorney General in May that same year, as Congress was required to approve these regulations. An important caveat to note was the fact that the order of precedence on the muster roll call often determined the petty officer hierarchy. Until 1863, there was no instruction for ratings or rank structure. Servicemen were paid based on their value to the Navy. The only true divide amongst petty officers prior to 1863 was the two categories they were distributed under, Petty Officers of the Line and Petty Officers of the Staff. On March 12, 1863, U.S. Navy Regulations detailed the precedence of ratings as per the following statement provided by the Naval History and Heritage website:

Precedence among petty officers of the same rate, if not established particularly by the commander or the vessel, will be determined by priority of rating. When two or more have received the same rate on the same day, and the commander of the vessel shall not have designated one of that rate to act as a chief, such as chief boatswain's mate, chief gunner's mate, or chief or signal quartermaster, their precedence shall be determined by the order in which their names appear on the ship's books. And precedence among petty officers of the same relative rank is to be

determined by priority of rating; or in case of ratings being of the same date, by the order in which their names appear on the ship's books. (Resources and Research, FAQs, Chief Petty Officer, para. 7, 1993)

In 1865, a revised Navy Regulation gave Commanding Officers the authority to designate precedence amongst petty officers of the same rate. This system was utilized for advancement until 1968, when the Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERS) Manual published Change No. 17 in August 1968. This revision by BUPERS executed the following, “precedence among ratings was eliminated and changed to a single system for military and non-military matters based on pay grade and time in grade” (Naval History and Heritage, Resources and Research, FAQs, Chief Petty Officer, para. 8, 1993).

Executed July 1, 1864, General Order No. 36 listed all the Navy ratings and the monthly pay for each. Some of the early maritime ratings included various ratings within the Boatswain’s Mate rating, Gunner’s Mate rating, and Quartermaster rating. Of these ratings, each included Chief Boatswain’s Mate, Chief Gunner’s Mate, and Chief Quartermaster (often known as Signal Quartermaster until 1885). Using “Chief” in these early ratings was to help designate the different assignments each rating was responsible for during this period. These titles were used throughout the next 29 years with different variations of each rating coming and going based on the function of a petty officer.

The earliest known use of the term “Chief” occurred during the Revolutionary War aboard the USS *Alfred*. The USS *Alfred* operated during the early years of the Continental Navy. Jacob Wasbie was a Cook’s Mate serving aboard the USS *Alfred* and “was promoted to ‘Chief Cook’ on June 1, 1776. Chief Cook is construed to mean Cook or Ship’s Cook, which was the official rating title at that time” (Naval History and Heritage, Resources and Research, FAQs, Chief Petty Officer, para. 2, 1993). The following excerpt talks about the first use of the term “Chief Petty Officer.”

The term “Chief Petty Officer” was first used in connection with the Master-at-Arms rating. As early as 1865, Navy regulations stated: The Master-at-Arms will be the Chief Petty Officer of the ship in which he shall serve. All orders from him in regard to the police of the vessel, the preservation of order, and obedience to regulations must be obeyed by all petty officers and others of the crew. But he shall have no right to

succession in command, and shall exercise no authority in matters not specified above. (History of the Chief Petty Officer Rate, para. 8&9, 2009)

This title of “Chief” that was given to the senior Master-at-Arms Petty Officer aboard a ship was one of function or positional title, rather than rank.

Until 1885, there was no official document that designated the various enlisted rates. On January 8, 1885, Navy Regulation Circular No. 41 was implemented. The main classifications that came out of this regulation were that petty officers and Seaman (non-petty officers) were designated as first, second, and third class. There were also three classes; Seaman, Special, and Artificer that were established along with the Marines. Notice several ratings have “Chief” within their title, but no CPO rank had been established to this point. Table 5 illustrates this new rank structure and classes.

Table 5. U.S. Navy Regulations Circular No. 41

U.S. Navy Regulation Circular No. 41				
	Seaman Class	Special Class	Artificer Class	Marines
PO1	Chief Boatswain's Mate Chief Quartermasters Chief Gunner's Mate	Master-at-Arms Equipment Yeoman Apothecaries Paymaster's Yeoman Engineer's Yeoman Ship's Writers School Masters Band Masters	Machinist's	1st Sergeants
PO2	Boatswain's Mate Quartermasters Coxswains to Commander-in-Chief	Ship's Corporals Ship's Cooks Chief Musicians	Boilermakers Armorers Carpenter's Mates Blacksmiths Sailmaker's Mates Water Tenders	Sergeants

U.S. Navy Regulation Circular No. 41				
	Seaman Class	Special Class	Artificer Class	Marines
PO3	Captains of Forecastle Captains of Main Top Captains of Mizzen Top Captains of Afterguard Coxswains Quarter-Gunners Seaman-Gunners	Captains of Hold	Printers, Painters, Oilers	Corporals
SN1	Seamen Seaman-Apprentices 1st class	Lamplighters Jack-of-the-Dust Buglers Musicians 1st class Tailors Barbers	Fireman 1st class Carpenters Caulkers	Musicians Orderlies
SN2	Ordinary Seaman Seaman-Apprentices 2nd class	Baymen Musicians	Fireman 1st class	Privates
SN3	Landsman Apprentices 1st class Apprentices 2nd class Apprentices 3rd class Boys		Coal Heavers	

Adapted from "Chief Petty Officers Academy History website," by Tom Jansing, 2010.

From 1885 to 1893, there is no evidence that the Chief Petty Officer rank was established. In February 1893, the Chief Petty Officer rank came to fruition as stated in the following passage.

But then an executive order issued by President Benjamin Harrison dated 25 February 1893 and issued as General Order No. 409 of 25 February 1893 gave a pay scale for Navy enlisted men. It was divided into rates and listed CPOs. Both the executive order and Circular No. 1 listed Chief Petty Officer as a distinct rate for the first time and both were to take

effect on 1 April 1893. It appears that this is the date on which the Chief Petty Officer rate actually was established. (History of the Chief Petty Officer Rate, para. 13, 2009)

Figure 1 is a copy of General Order No. 409 signed and executed by President Benjamin Harrison on February 25, 1893, followed by Figure 2, U.S. Navy Regulation Circular No.1, which officially established the classification of chief petty officer on March 13, 1893. Both the executive order and U.S. Navy Regulation Circular No.1 were made effective April 1, 1893.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

GENERAL ORDER
No. 409

WASHINGTON, February 25, 1893

The following Executive Order is published for the information and guidance of all persons concerned.

B. F. TRACY,
Secretary of the Navy

EXECUTIVE MANSION, WASHINGTON, D.C., February 25, 1893

On and after the 1st day of April, 1893, the pay of the Petty Officers and other enlisted men of the Navy shall be as follows, but his order shall not reduce the pay or rating of any enlisted man during his present enlistment, below, the rate or pay at which he was enlisted, or in which he is now serving, unless he shall be reduced in rating as provided by law or regulations:

RATING	Monthly Pay	RATING	Monthly Pay
Chief Masters-at-Arms	\$65.00	Painters	\$30.00
Chief Boatswains' Mates	50.00	Carpenters' Mates, third class	30.00
Chief Gunners' Mates	50.00	Firemen, first class	35.00
Chief Quartermasters	50.00	Firemen, second class	30.00
Masters-at-Arms, first class	40.00	Shipwrights	25.00
Boatswains' Mates, first class	40.00	Sailmakers	25.00
Gunners' Mates, first class	40.00	Coal Passers	22.00
Quartermasters, first class	40.00	Bandmasters	52.00
Schoolmasters	40.00	Yeomen	60.00
Masters-at-Arms, second class	35.00	Apothecaries	60.00
Boatswains' Mates, second class	35.00	Writers, first class	35.00
Gunners' Mates, second class	35.00	First Musicians	36.00
Quartermasters, second class	35.00	Writers, second class	30.00
Masters-at-Arms, third class	30.00	Writers, third class	25.00
Coxswains (1)	30.00	Musicians, first class	32.00
Gunners' Mates, third class	30.00	Musicians, second class	30.00
Quartermasters, third class	30.00	Buglers	30.00
Seamen Gunners	26.00	Baymen	18.00
Seamen (2)	24.00	Ship's Cooks, first class	35.00
Apprentices, first class	21.00	Ships' Cooks, second class	30.00
Ordinary Seamen	19.00	Ships' Cooks, third class	25.00
Apprentices, second class	15.00	Ships' Cooks, fourth class	20.00
Landsmen (3)	16.00	Stewards to Commanders-in-Chief	45.00
Apprentices, third class	9.00	Stewards to Commandants	45.00
Machinists	70.00	Cabin Stewards	37.00
Chief Carpenters' Mates	50.00	Wardroom Stewards	37.00
Boilermakers	60.00	Steerage Stewards	25.00
Coppersmiths	50.00	Warrant Officers' Stewards	24.00
Blacksmiths	50.00	Cooks to Commanders-in-Chief	40.00
Carpenters' Mates, first class	40.00	Cooks to Commandants	40.00
Plumbers and Fitters	45.00	Cabin Cooks	32.00
Water Tenders	38.00	Wardroom Cooks	32.00
Sailmakers' Mates	40.00	Steerage Cooks	22.00
Oilers	36.00	Warrant Officers' Cooks	20.00
Carpenters' Mates, second class	35.00	Mess Attendants	16.00
Printers	35.00		

(1) Coxswains detailed as Coxswains of steam launches, or as Coxswains to Commanders-in-Chief shall receive five dollars per month in addition to their pay.

(2) Seamen in charge of Holds shall receive five dollars per month in addition to their pay.

(3) Landsmen assigned to duty as Jacks-of-the-Dust or as Lamplighters shall receive five dollars per month in addition to their pay.

BENJ. HARRISON

- (1) Coxswains detailed as Coxswains of steam launches, or as Coxswains to Commanders-in-Chief shall receive five dollars per month in addition to their pay.
- (2) Seamen in charge of Holds shall receive five dollars per month in addition to their pay.
- (3) Landsmen assigned to duty as Jacks-of-the-Dust or as Lamplighters shall receive five dollars per month in addition to their pay.

BENJ. HARRISON

Adapted from "Goat Locker website; CPO Resources; General Order No. 409," by direction of executive order, 1893.

Figure 1. General Order No. 409

The inaugural chief petty officer classification included only eight ratings as Figure 2 indicates, and was divided among three branches as follows: Seaman Branch (four ratings), Artificer Branch (two ratings), and Special Branch (two ratings).

U.S. NAVY REGULATION CIRCULAR No. 1			
NAVY DEPARTMENT WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 13, 1893			
The following classification of petty officers and enlisted men in the Navy, and of the noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates in the Marine Corps, is hereby adopted, to take effect on and after April 1, 1893:			
CLASSIFICATION			
CHIEF PETTY OFFICER			
SEAMAN BRANCH	ARTIFICER BRANCH	SPECIAL BRANCH	MARINES
Chief Master-at-Arms Chief Boatswain's Mate Chief Gunner's Mate Chief Quartermaster	Machinist Chief Carpenter Mate	Yeomen Apothecaries	Sergeants Major First Sergeants in charge of guard
PETTY OFFICER, FIRST CLASS			
Master-at-Arms, 1st Class Boatswain's Mate, 1st Class Gunner's Mate, 1st Class Quartermaster, 1st Class Schoolmaster	Boilermakers Carpenter Blacksmith Plumbers and Fitters Sailmakers Mate Carpenters Mate, 1st Class Water Tender	First Musician Writers, 1st Class	First Sergeant
PETTY OFFICER, SECOND CLASS			
Master-at-Arms, 2d Class Boatswain's Mate, 2d Class Quartermaster, 2d Class	Carpenters Mate, 2d Class Printers Oilers	Writers, 2d Class	Sergeants
PETTY OFFICER, THIRD CLASS			
Master-at-Arms, 3d Class Coxswain Gunner's Mate, 3d Class Quartermaster, 3d Class	Carpenters Mate, 3d Class Painters	Writers, 3d Class	Corporals

Adapted from "Goat Locker website; CPO Resources; U.S. Navy Regulation Circular No.1," by direction of executive order, 1893.

Figure 2. U.S. Navy Regulation Circular No. 1

There is no one person who is known as the first Chief Petty Officer. Nearly all sailors carrying the rating of Petty Officer First Class in 1893 were automatically "advanced" to the Chief Petty Officer rating. The development of rating badges and the gold foul anchor is worth noting, as it is such an important part of the CPO uniform

today. The original rating badge worn came from the Master-at-Arms rating badge, which had three chevrons, an eagle, and three arcs (known as rockers today). This led to the origin of the CPO chevron, which has a single rocker and became official in 1894. The CPO uniform first displayed the foul anchor as a cap device in 1905. The gold foul anchor as a collar device became an official component of the CPO uniform in 1959. The 1893 rating badges and insignia for chief petty officers can be seen in Appendix C.

3. Development of Compensation System (Pay Grade)

After the CPO rating was established, the pay scale remained non-existent until the formal structuring of the pay grades was established in 1920. “The act of May 18, 1920, effective January 1, 1920, standardized pay at all levels from the lowest non-rated grade, which was Apprentice Seaman, through Chief Petty Officer” (Naval History and Heritage, Resources and Research, FAQs, Chief Petty Officer, para. 24, 1993). Throughout the Navy’s pay grade history, different variations have been utilized. In 1922, “the pay grades of 1 and 1-A to 7 were established” (Naval History and Heritage, Resources and Research, FAQs, Chief Petty Officer, para. 24, 1993). Eventually, in October 1949 the Career Compensation Act was established. The significance of this Act led to the reversal of pay grades (7 being more senior, a chief, and 1 being less senior) and the letter “E” was added to the pay grade vernacular for enlisted personnel. Hence, the pay grade structure was E-1 through E-7 (Apprentice Seaman to Chief Petty Officer). The pay grades E-8 and E-9 did not exist. These two senior most enlisted pay grades will be discussed in the subsequent section. For further details on the Career Compensation Act of 1949, refer to Appendix D. Table 6 details the U.S. Navy’s current enlisted pay grades and titles that coincide with each other.

Table 6. Enlisted Pay Grades and Titles

<u>Pay grade</u>	<u>Title</u>
E-9	Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy (MCPON)
E-9	Master Chief Petty Officer (MCPO)
E-8	Senior Chief Petty Officer (SCPO)
E-7	Chief Petty Officer (CPO)
E-6	Petty Officer First Class (PO1)
E-5	Petty Officer Second Class (PO2)
E-4	Petty Officer Third Class (PO3)

<u>Pay grade</u>	<u>Title</u>
E-3	General Apprenticeship (No Abbreviation)
E-2	General Apprenticeship, Apprentice (No Abbreviation)
E-1	General Apprenticeship, Recruit (No Abbreviation)

Adapted from "Navy Personnel Command (NPC), MILPERSMAN 1223-010 Enlisted Pay grades and Titles website." by NPC, 2008.

4. Establishment of Master Chief and Senior Chief Petty Officer

The establishment of the E-8 and E-9 pay grades, better known as Senior Chief Petty Officer (SCPO) and Master Chief Petty Officer (MCPO) were a result of many years of rank congestion, retention, and playing a larger technological role in the Cold War. Additionally, senior enlisted could often find higher wages in the civilian or private sector. The creation of E-8 and E-9 became a foregone conclusion. The following excerpt explains how the pay grades E-8 and E-9 were created through Public Law 85-422.

The Defense Advisory Committee on Professional Technical Compensation (commonly called the Cordiner Committee) was created in March 1956 "to study a possible adjustment to the existing pay structure" for retention purposes. On 8 May 1957 they recommended to the Secretary of Defense that pay grades E-8 and E-9 be created in all the services. The recommendations of the Cordiner Committee were introduced to Congress in several forms. In 1958, legislation called the Kilday Bill was passed, became Public Law 85-422 and established the E-8 and E-9 pay grades in the U.S. Armed Forces. (Non-commissioned Officer History, para. 1, 2008)

The original percentage of E-8s and E-9s was 1.5 percent and 0.5 percent, respectively. These numbers were later shifted to one percent for E-9s and two percent for E-8s. Eligible SCPO candidates had to have four years in grade and ten years of service, while MCPO candidates had to have six years minimum service as a CPO and 13 total years of service. The first promotions were made effective in November of 1958 based on the results of the examinations given in August 1958. After the first few promotion cycles, the Navy mandated in 1959 that promotion to E-9 must channel directly through E-8 only.

5. Brief History on Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy (MCPON)

The Office of the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy has been in existence for over 43 years. Since the inception of the MCPON office in 1967, there have been 12 MCPONs, the most recent being, MCPON (SS/SW) Rick D. West. The Office of the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy was established to bridge the gap between the enlisted personnel on the deck-plates and officer leadership. The deck-plate concerns and what senior leadership perceived were not aligned. The Navy established the Senior Enlisted Advisor of the Navy to address these concerns and ensure communications were clear, up and down the chain of command. The first Senior Enlisted Advisor of the Navy was GMCM (Master Chief Gunner's Mate) Delbert D. Black. He was selected to serve a four year term starting on January 13, 1967, ending on April 1, 1971. The official title of the office was changed to Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy on April 28, 1967. MCPON Black reported directly as the senior enlisted advisor to the Chief of Naval Personnel (CNP); all other 11 MCPONs have reported to both the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) and CNP.

The following two passages give reference to the importance of the MCPON as written by the late Admiral (ADM) Elmo Russell Zumwalt, Jr. and spoken by Admiral (ADM) Carlisle Albert Herman Trost, both former CNOs, from the *Winds of Change* by Charlotte D. Crist.

When the Office of the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy was created in 1967, the U.S. Navy took a giant step forward in untapping the leadership capabilities of its enlisted force. In the act of adding an extra gold star to a master chief's crow, the senior levels of command were, in effect, saying to the enlisted community, we respect and value your opinion, we need your input, and we will listen and act. (Zumwalt, foreword from *Winds of Change*, p. iv, 1992)

No matter what we think is the reality of a situation, there is probably another reality on the deck plates, and our people need and deserve leaders who know what the reality is. The Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy is chartered to observe and act, not to supersede the regular chain of command, but to strengthen it and make it work better. His or hers are the experienced eyes that can see the reality of the deck plates. Indeed, he is the pulse-taker of the command. (Trost, on the occasion of the MCPON change of office, p. 1, 1988)

Refer to Appendix E to view the insignia of the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy. Of note, the MCPON wears three stars on his uniform, slightly different from the everyday master chief, who wears two stars. A complete list of MCPONs is detailed in Appendix F. Appendix G provides a detailed list of the MCPON Leadership Mess, which includes Fleet, Force, and Command Master Chiefs at major headquarters. The MCPON Leadership Mess consists of four FLTCMs, 16 FORCMs, and 60 CMDCMs.

B. NAVY RATINGS

This section will give a brief description on Navy ratings and how they have impacted the Navy's manpower. There is an enormous amount of information on Navy ratings, categories, and Navy Enlisted Classification (NECs) codes. The author will limit this section, with a greater importance on discussing the particular ratings of the participants in this study as well as the CMDCM (Command Master Chief) rating, due to its relevance in this study.

1. Ratings

A Navy rating identifies the enlisted persons field of expertise; it only applies to petty officers, E-4 and above. Each rating is essentially an occupation that consists of specific skills and abilities utilized to perform a job. Each rating has its own specialty badge which is worn on the left sleeve by all qualified men and women in that rating. Unofficial ratings came about upon the inception of the Continental Navy in 1775. During the early years, sailors did jobs based on the requirements of their particular ship. As jobs became more engrained in the daily activities, titles were adapted, leading to the basis and eventual inception of petty officers and ratings in the Navy.

The Navy's enlisted rating system has developed for over 230 years, resulting in the evolving rating system the Navy has today. Ratings evolve as dictated by the overall mission of the Navy changes. Meaning, as new equipment, techniques, and technology come aboard, the Navy must change to sustain a competitive advantage over their allies and enemies alike. A great example of this is how the Navy has shifted from steam to gas turbine engines on numerous ships (the Navy also has diesel ships, and nuclear run ships and submarines). The rating for this particular example in recent years has gone

from Boiler Technician (BT) to Machinist Mate-Surface (MM) for remaining steam ships and to Gas Turbine System Technician (GSE - Electrical and GSM - Mechanical) for gas turbine ships.

Enlisted ratings are separated into four categories. These categories are essentially based on pay grade and occupation. The four categories of ratings are explained in Table 7. This study primarily focuses on Compression Ratings such as FLTCM, FORCM, and CMDCM.

Table 7. Navy Rating Categories

Navy Rating Categories
1. <u>General Ratings</u> (Secretary of the Navy (SECNAV) Approved): Identify personnel from pay grades E-4 through E-9. They provide the primary means of identifying billet requirements and personnel qualifications. Each rating has a distinctive rating badge.
2. <u>Service Ratings</u> (Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Approved): These are subdivisions of certain general ratings. Service Ratings identify required specialization and specific areas of qualifications in the utilization and training of personnel. The rating badge for a Service Rating is the same as that for the General Rating.
3. <u>Compression Ratings</u> : Identify the combining of several General or Service Ratings at pay grade E-9 to form broader career fields when the occupational content is similar. These ratings exist only at the E-9 level and are not identified previously as a General or Service Rating.
4. <u>General Rate</u> : Identify personnel occupationally in pay grades E-1 through E-3.

Adapted from "Navy Personnel Command (NPC), Chapter III Navy Ratings and Entry Series NECs website." by NPC, 2010.

Appendix H gives a detailed list of occupational fields and ratings that are associated with each field. Appendix I gives a complete list of each enlisted rating along with a picture of each specialty mark that indicates the rating.

2. Ratings of the Participants in This Study

This study involved 19 master chief participants, 17 active duty and two retired. Of the 19, there are 14 different ratings this group has donned (ET NUC - two, YN - two, HM - three, SK - two, and the remaining ratings had one). The participants in this study represent approximately 23 percent (14/61) of the ratings, the U.S. Navy has today. Each participant either currently wears (non-CMDCM/FLTCM/FORCMs), or has worn one of the ratings listed in Table 8, before they became a FLTCM, FORCM, or CMDCM.

Table 8. List of Current Rate and Former Ratings Representing Participants

Current Rate	Rating Prior to CMDCM	Active Duty (AD) or Retired
GSCM	GS	AD
CMDCM	ET NUC	AD
CMDCM	YN	AD
FTCM	FT	Retired
CMDCM	AM	AD
HMCN	HM	AD
CMDCM	FC	AD
CMDCM	SK	AD
CMDCM	HM	AD
CTRCN	CTR	AD
CMDCM	EN	AD
NCCN	NC	AD
CTNCN	CTN	AD
CMDCM	YN	AD
CMDCM	CTI	AD
NDCN	ND	AD
FORCN	HM	AD
FLTCN	SK	AD
ETCN	ET NUC	Retired

Today, the Navy's enlisted rating structure is essential for Navy Manpower Analysis Center (NAVMAC). According to Military Personnel Manual (MILPERSMAN) 1221-030, NAVMAC's mission statement is, "tasked to collect, process, and analyze occupational information involving job content and tasking of enlisted ratings and officer specialties within the Navy" (MILPERSMAN 1221-030, 2008, p. 1). The rating structure plays a key role in detailing, career development, advancement, training, and overall strength planning for the Navy. Many ratings no longer exist; however, Boatswain's Mate (BM), Quartermaster (QM), and Gunner's Mate (GM) have survived the numerous changes and evolution of ratings. Through the years, the Navy has utilized over 100 ratings, with 61 remaining in use today.

C. PRESENT DAY MASTER CHIEF PETTY OFFICER

1. Mission

The mission of the chief petty officer (CPO) is best stated according to the Chief Petty Officer Mission Statement. “Provide leadership to the Enlisted Force and advice to Navy leadership to create combat-ready Naval Forces” (CPO Guiding Principles, para. 1, 2009). Simply put, CPOs strive to lead the enlisted men and women of the naval forces, along with providing recommendations to the officer leadership, which will create a culture and standard of performance that will lead to sustained, mission-ready forces.

2. Vision

The vision of the chief petty officer is best stated according to the Chief Petty Officer Vision Statement.

A senior enlisted force that serves first and foremost as Deck-plate Leaders committed to developing Sailors and enforcing standards; remains responsive, aligned and well-connected to both Leadership and Sailors; and conducts itself in a consistently professional, ethical and traditional manner. (CPO Guiding Principles, para. 2, 2009)

The chief petty officer vision is leadership, as they are committed to developing the enlisted manpower and creating a culture with higher standards that all sailors will be held accountable to maintain. Manpower is the chief’s greatest asset, developing and coaching subordinates will create better technicians and sailors alike today, and future leaders for tomorrow. Chief petty officers are the link between officer leadership and enlisted forces. Combining their experience and knowledge, enables CPOs to train and mold young sailors and officers, as well as offer sound advice to senior leaders to promote more informed decision making. Maintaining high standards from the realm of ethics, professional knowledge, traditions, and everyday operations has cemented the chief petty officer’s vision.

3. Guiding Principles

There are seven guiding principles that chief petty officers must actively utilize as their approach in leading and aiding in accomplishing the mission and vision of the United States Navy. They are as follows: Deck-plate Leadership, Institutional and Technical Expertise, Professionalism, Character, Loyalty, Active Communication, and Sense of Heritage. The guiding principles are best summarized in Table 9 as per the CPO Guiding Principles.

Table 9. CPO Guiding Principles

CPO Guiding Principles
<u>Deck-plate Leadership</u> – Chiefs are visible leaders who set the tone. We will know the mission, know our Sailors, and develop them beyond their expectations as a team and as individuals.
<u>Institutional and Technical Expertise</u> - Chiefs are the experts in their field. We will use experience and technical knowledge to produce a well trained enlisted and officer team.
<u>Professionalism</u> – Chiefs will actively teach, uphold, and enforce standards. We will measure ourselves by the success of our Sailors. We will remain invested in the Navy through self-motivated military and academic education and training and will provide proactive solutions that are well founded, thoroughly considered, and linked to mission accomplishment.
<u>Character</u> – Chiefs abide by an uncompromising code of integrity, take full responsibility for their actions and keep their word. This will set a positive tone for the command, unify the Mess, and create esprit de corps.
<u>Loyalty</u> – Chiefs remember that loyalty must be demonstrated to seniors, peers and subordinates alike, and that it must never be blind. Few things are more important than people who have the moral courage to question the appropriate direction in which an organization is headed and then the strength to support whatever final decisions are made.
<u>Active Communication</u> – Chiefs encourage open and frank dialog, listen to Sailors and energize the communication flow up and down the chain of command. This will increase unit efficiency, mission readiness, and mutual respect.
<u>Sense of Heritage</u> - Defines our past and guides our future. Chiefs will use heritage to connect Sailors to their past, teach values and enhance pride in service to our country.

Adapted from “CPO Guiding Principles, para. 2.” by Goatlocker website 2009.

D. SUMMARY OF CPO HISTORY AND PREVIEW OF EARNING THE GOLD FOUL ANCHORS

The history of the chief petty officer is approaching 117 years of existence. The duties and leadership of the CPO continue to evolve as the threats and challenges to America are ever-changing. It is essential that CPO leadership strive to live by the CPO Guiding Principles. There are innate forces that challenge these principles on a daily basis. Senior enlisted leadership must show unflappable fortitude to each challenge and

understand the importance of the leadership role they perform in the U.S. Navy. The mission and vision statements that are set forth revolve around the CPO ranks aligning officer leadership and enlisted forces to maximize resources for sustained, superior mission-ready operations from the deck-plate up. These “core” values have determined and will continue to determine the direction and shape senior enlisted leadership will take in the coming years. This study focuses on senior enlisted leadership and whether or not the current leadership methods can sustain the Navy into the 21st century. The remaining chapters provide qualitative evidence of what the future holds for senior enlisted leadership in America’s great Navy.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. OVERVIEW OF EARNING THE GOLD FOUL ANCHORS

“The dictionary is the only place that success comes before work. Hard work is the price we must pay for success. I think you can accomplish anything if you’re willing to pay the price.” – Vince Lombardi

A. CAREER PATH

Earning the rank of E-7 (Chief Petty Officer) is arguably the greatest milestone achievement for an enlisted person. Becoming a chief petty officer (CPO), not only cements a career of accomplishment, but directly anoints them as a senior enlisted leader within the Navy and the command they serve. This chapter serves as an additional function to the foundation for explaining the data analyses that are represented in the results chapter of this study. The overview of earning the gold foul anchors details the career path of the chief petty officer. The explanation is generic as numerous people have achieved the rank of CPO through the years. There is no, one career path that outlines how to achieve the pay grade of chief petty officer and beyond.

1. Progressing Through the Ranks

Earning the right to wear the gold foul anchors does not come easy. A sailor must persevere, take the tough jobs and do well while serving in that capacity, and must be willing to wait for the honorable opportunity of becoming a chief petty officer. Table 10 is an abbreviated version of the enlisted minimum requirements for promotion in the Navy. These minimums are established by the Department of Defense (DoD) and must be met before being considered for advancement.

Table 10. Navy Enlisted Minimum Requirements for Promotion

Pay grade	E-1 to E-2	E-2 to E-3	E-3 to E-4	E-4 to E-5	E-5 to E-6	E-6 to E-7	E-7 to E-8	E-8 to E-9
Time-in-Grade (TIG)	9 months	9 months as E-2	6 months as E-3	12 months as E-4	48 months as E-5	48 months as E-6	60 months as E-7	36 months as E-8

Adapted from “Total Active Federal Military Service (TAFMS).” by TAFMS website 2010.

There are special circumstances when individuals may be promoted outside these guidelines, as discussed in the following excerpt.

Provisions exist for early advancements. An early advancement candidate is one who does not meet the TAFMS (Total Active Federal Military Service) minimum service requirement. No more than 10 percent of the total number of sailors in pay grades E-7, E-8, and E-9 may have less than the prescribed TAFMS. Therefore, a limited number of early selectee quotas are available to the selection board. CNO (Chief of Naval Operations) planners check the TAFMS and inform the board of the percentage of early advancements allowed by the Navy in meeting DOD restrictions. The percentage is an overall board figure, not a quota by rate. Some panels, or “tables” within the selection board may recommend more selectees. They base their recommendations on the average time in service for each rating, which varies yearly. (Drewry, p. 53, 2007)

The average enlisted person is advanced to CPO around 12–14 years of service. Refer to Appendix J for a more detailed outline of the enlisted minimum requirements for promotion.

2. CPO Board Selection Process

Prior to a board convening, a Naval Administrative Message (NAVADMIN) is sent out from the Chief of Naval Personnel (CNP), with specific business rules and guidelines. Generally, this NAVADMIN includes such guidelines as the convening date of the board and rank that is under consideration for the next higher pay grade.

The selection process for CPO eligible members is arduous, involving an extensive review of a service member’s record by approximately 65–70 officers and enlisted board members, while taking into account the quotas available for each rating. The maximum quotas per rating are established by manpower planners from CNP. The board may not exceed set quotas outlined by the planners; however, the board may recommend less than the maximum quotas if a rating does not have enough “best and fully qualified” candidates. The selection board is convened by the Chief of Naval Personnel. Each year an instruction, called a precept, is prepared for the board. The precept outlines the selection process and gives general guidance to the board regarding such selection criteria as rating (each rating is addressed individually by a rating panel) and equal opportunity considerations. The precept varies only slightly from year to year. The oath administered to board members and recorders upon convening, is contained in the precept. The precept also outlines the expected conduct and performance of persons

serving with the board. The board members are appointed by the CNP and, as indicated by the following excerpt, this appointment is to be taken extremely seriously with great reverence by all board members. Of note, the fourth sentence truly drives this point home.

I have personally appointed the members of this board. During the board process the personnel assigned as board members work directly for me, under oath. Board members are entrusted with selecting the future leadership of the Navy. The performance of these duties will have a greater effect on the future of the Navy than any other duty they perform. During the board process, all other duties of an assigned member are secondary to the board process, and the utmost care will be given to ensure the process is not compromised or rushed to accommodate outside concerns. Each record reviewed represents years of service by the individual candidate. It is absolutely essential that our evaluation afford each eligible candidate fair and equitable consideration. (CNP, Letter to the President of the FY-10 Active Duty Navy Chief Petty Officer Selection Board, para. 3, 2009)

The enlisted board members hail from nearly every rating, including Command Master Chief's (CMD CM), with former rating expertise, which provides a relevant aspect of appropriate selection criteria, during that particular board cycle. The mission of a CPO selection board is rather simple; select the best, most fully qualified, First Class Petty Officers (PO1) who have clearly demonstrated the potential for service at the next higher pay grade. It is important to note, CPO selection includes not only requirements of time in service, superior evaluations, and rating examinations, but of possible more importance, this selection carries an added requirement of peer review. As discussed previously, a chief petty officer can only advance after review, followed by a recommendation by the selection board. This board includes senior officers (O-5 and above) and master chief petty officers, in effect, "choosing their own" and conversely not choosing others.

a. General Board Information

With all the moving variables involved in the board selection and members, there is a team concept that must be developed, and all differences must be put aside for the betterment of the service members. For all teams, there are common periods

of forming, storming, norming, and performing (Smith, FY-10 Chief Petty Officer Selection Board Power Point, 2009). Each phase's duration varies, depending on several variables, such as familiarity, personalities, and leadership, to name a few. The board members convene for approximately a week, and the days are very long, lasting approximately 12 hours. The early stages involve establishing standardized grading criteria with a score sheet, screening records, and developing a plan of action that will ensure completion by the scheduled end-date.

b. Board Process

There are three distinct phases of the board process: individual record screening, the crunch zone, and slate approval. Prior to any of the records being viewed, each rating group panel determines the point value their panel will utilize during the selection process. This gives the panel a method to weigh each element, resulting in more consist grading for each panel. The panels are divided into rating group panels, based on ratings. All panels make-up the selection board.

The first phase is the individual record screening. In this phase, all of the records are independently scored at least twice, taking the average score. If there is less than a 100 point differential between the two scores, the record is satisfactory. If there is greater than a 100 point differential, then the two graders must discuss the scores, coming to an agreement below the 100 point differential. A third independent grader will determine the final score, if the two graders cannot agree on a differential less than 100 points. Once records are weighed with no scoring discrepancies, a "working ladder" is established, ranking candidates in order, strictly from highest to lowest (averaging two scores).

The second phase is the crunch zone. The "crunch zone" is determined after the score "ladder" is identified. This essentially is the "cut-off" where the point total considered high enough, is based on the results of the ladder score, making a particular score significant. The "ladder" is best explained in the following three sentences. Once crunch zone discussions are completed, the candidates are arranged in order from highest to lowest based on a vote by all the board members. This is called the

“ladder.” There are a series of ladders: one is established once the average score is decided, another is established for the crunch zone, and a final ladder is established for selection to aid with discussion.

For simplicity, this example will allow the selection board panel, 50 slots to fill. Selection is not as easy as drawing a line at record 50 and automatically selecting the top 50 highest scores. There is a need to discuss and compare the records to ensure the best and fully qualified candidates are selected for advancement. This leads to the “crunch zone.” The crunch zone includes the top 50 records and an unspecified number of records below 50. This may be the next 10–20 records, and is usually determined where there is the greatest point difference. This point difference and the point total are determined by each board, essentially creating the scale. Normally, the scores are very tight for the top records with differences within a .5–1 point range. Where there is a significant point difference between records (two or more points), the panel will agree to “draw the line” (panel officer makes the final decision after a discussion by the panel) and “crunch” all records above the line. For this example, the line could be at 65, 15 below the top 50. All records now in the crunch zone are discussed and reviewed as needed to determine which of the 65 are the “best and fully qualified.” This can be detrimental for those with a higher score, as they may slide off the list. This is in large part due to where the points came from, such as education and awards, as opposed to leadership experience and command impact, among others. The quota limit plays a significant role during this phase of the selection process. Those sailors that fall on either side of the quota limit are considered again through deliberations to ensure the recommended CPO selectees are truly the best, most fully qualified candidates for E-7.

The third phase is the slate approval. When the slate is briefed, “the entire board receives a brief on the rating’s structure, its job, its peculiarities, the number of candidates considered, and the backgrounds of those people recommended and not recommended for selection. During this briefing, no names are given” (Chief Petty Officer’s Manual, p. 55, 2007). Omitting names reduces bias for board members that may know a candidate. The slating generally involves the last select versus the first three non-selects. Board members review the strengths and weaknesses of these candidates,

acting as a self-check to make certain the best, most fully qualified sailors are selected. A board must accept a slate by majority, in order for it to pass. If slate fails twice, it is sent back to the board to revise for another deliberation.

Some of the generic enhancers (strengths) and detractors (weaknesses) of the candidates that a board may observe are listed in Table 11.

Table 11. Factors for Candidates Eligible for E-7 Promotion

<u>Factors for Candidates Eligible for E-7 Promotion</u>	
<u>Enhancers</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained, superior performance • Demonstrate quantified leadership (other services, civilians, coalition forces, etc.) • Individual Augmentee (IA) assignment, gave competitive advantage for breakout • Taking challenging billets (especially doing sea duty to sea duty) • Sailorization tours (instrumental in educating and developing sailors; RTC (Recruit Training Command), A/C schools, Recruiting) 	
<u>Detractors</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Judicial Punishment (NJP) or Court-Martial • Physical Fitness Assessment (PFA) failure • Essentially any other negative documented misconduct or administrative action, other than NJP • Lack of breakout among peers 	

Adapted from "FY-10 Chief Petty Officer Selection Board Power Point." by CMDCM (SW/AW) Russell Smith, 2010.

The final recommendations are completed as follows:

All members sign a written report of the board's recommendations and submit it to the Chief of Naval Personnel for approval. The report must certify that the board followed all instructions and directions in the precept and carefully considered the case of every candidate. (The Chief Petty Officer's Manual, p. 55, 2007)

Upon approval by the CNP, a NAVADMIN message outlining each rating of CPO selectees is released to the fleet.

3. Continuation Boards

Senior Enlisted Continuation Boards (SECB) are designed to optimize quality manpower in the senior enlisted ranks. These boards are held annually to review the records of eligible master chiefs, senior chiefs, and chief petty officers. A senior enlisted

person must have 20 years of service (YOS) and three years, time-in-grade (TIG) to be eligible for a continuation board. “Members not selected for continuation must transfer to the Fleet Reserve or retire” (Navy.mil, CNP Provides Update for Senior Enlisted Continuation Boards, para. 8, 2009). The Continuation Board panel rewards members based on the criteria the Navy desires, as mentioned in the following statement.

Performance is the priority. Board members will be looking for those master chiefs, senior chiefs and chiefs who have the ability to get positive results. Additional consideration will be given to senior enlisted leaders who achieve success through leadership and personal performance while fostering well-trained enlisted and officer teams. (Bureau of Naval Personnel. (BUPERS), Senior Enlisted Continuation Board Fact Sheet, para. 3, 2009)

Some of the detractors that a panel would consider damaging include: substandard performance, misconduct, and failure of a physical fitness assessment (PFA). The following explains the board participants.

Board member composition will be comprised of a flag officer president plus at least one captain from the surface, submarine and aviation communities as well as the Navy Expeditionary Combat Command. Captains will serve as panel heads while additional panel officers, typically O-3 and above, will assist panel heads in a manner similar to the enlisted advancement boards. Selected active-duty and full-time-support (FTS) force, fleet and command master chiefs will serve as board members, and selected active-duty and FTS master chiefs will serve as recorders. (Navy.mil, CNP Provides Update for Senior Enlisted Continuation Boards, para. 6, 2009)

The Navy held its inaugural SECB in September 2009. This board retained more than 97 percent of the Navy’s CPOs, substantiating the strength of the CPO Mess. As stated, by Vice Admiral (VADM) Mark Ferguson, Chief of Naval Personnel (CNP), “the overwhelming continuance of our senior enlisted demonstrates the extraordinary quality of the chief petty officer mess” (Navy.mil, Navy Retains More Than 97 Percent from Senior Enlisted Continuation Board, para. 2, 2009). MCPON Rick West provided commentary on the board results as well.

There were chiefs with adverse information in their records, and many of them are staying. That, in itself, should tell any doubters that there was no quota, and that we are not a zero defect Navy. People make mistakes.

Often times, it's how we respond after those mistakes that defines us as chiefs, as Sailors and as leaders in our Navy. (Navy.mil, Navy Retains More Than 97 Percent from Senior Enlisted Continuation Board, para. 7, 2009)

Continuation Boards for senior enlisted are in their infant stages, but will remain vital to the Navy's force shaping of its senior enlisted sailors. These boards will serve as verification that the Navy values quality senior enlisted leaders who will continue to train and develop the sailors of tomorrow.

4. Evaluations

Fitness reports or performance evaluations essentially convey the performance of sailors during their time in the Navy. A sailor is generally evaluated once per year. Several other circumstances exist that require evaluations to be done more than once a year, such as a sailor detaching from his/her command, adverse (Non-judicial Punishment - NJP) evaluations, and several other occasions. Evaluations are arguably the most important aspect of a service member's record. These evaluations speak to the superior or substandard performance sailors have accumulated during their careers. Evaluations, as a segment of a sailor's record, represent a sailor when the sailor goes before a promotion board, among other things. Chief Petty Officers (CPOs) must understand how to write, interpret, and review evaluations to maximize not only their careers, but just as important, if not more important, the careers of those serving under them.

The most recent version of the CPO evaluation was initiated and executed by former Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy (MCPON) Joe R. Campa Jr. The newest version of E-7 through E-9 Evaluation and Counseling record (CHIEFEVAL) was implemented in September 2008. Prior to 2008, CPOs were evaluated using the same criteria (categories) as officers. The CHIEFEVAL focuses primarily on the Chief Petty Officer Mission, Vision, and Guiding Principles. The purpose of restructuring the evaluation process for CPOs is explained in the following passage by former MPCON Campa.

The CHIEFEVAL ensures our chiefs are evaluated based on the expectations we've traditionally had of them. The guiding principles reaffirmed those expectations. Incorporating them as performance traits was the next logical step in a process we started almost two years ago. (Navy.mil, New CPO Evaluation Takes Effect This September, June 2008)

Implementing of the CHIEFEVAL signals that the CPO Mess is intent on refocusing their efforts back to the basics of deck-plate leadership. The CHIEFEVAL complements the new performance traits, altering approximately 25 percent of the previous fitness report (FITREP). The evaluation may have changed in 2008, but the duties and responsibilities for the CPO remain since the inception of the CPO nearly 117 years ago. Table 12 lists the FITREP and CHIEFEVAL differences from the performance traits sections (block 33–39 on each form). This distinct difference is necessary, as the CPO in reality, is quite different from an officer. These performance traits highlight the CPO Mission, Vision, and Guiding Principles, allowing for better alignment of CPO expectations, selection, and evaluation. By pinpointing these traits, CPOs will be graded not only on the devotion to their principles, but the effectiveness in which they carry them out.

Table 12. FITREP and CHIEFEVAL Differences

FITREP and CHIEFEVAL Differences		
BLOCK	FITREP (Performance Trait)	CHIEFEVAL (Performance Trait)
33	Professional Expertise	Deck-plate Leadership
34	Command or Organizational Climate/Equal Opportunity	Institutional and Technical Expertise
35	Military Bearing/Character	Professionalism
36	Teamwork	Loyalty
37	Mission Accomplishment and Initiative	Character
38	Leadership	Active Communication
39	Tactical Performance	Sense of Heritage

Refer to Appendix K for the latest version of the officer Fitness Report (FITREP), Naval Personnel (NAVPERS) 1610/2, and Appendix L for the Chief Evaluation (CHIEFEVAL), Naval Personnel (NAVPERS) 1616/27, which became effective in June 2008, by direction of the CNP via NAVADMIN 176/08. Refer to Appendix M to view NAVADMIN 176/08.

B. TRAINING AND EDUCATION

1. Leadership Training

Leadership training is an ongoing experience for both officer and enlisted service members that aspire to be great leaders. Formal training is essential to reinforce effective leadership practices, as well as introduce fresh ideas and methods to implement. One of the best approaches to honing leadership skills is through on-the-job training. Experience develops skills and provides a leader with the opportunity to make key decisions that will only enhance his/her overall leadership. A key comment on CPO leadership experience was best stated in an interview with Fire Control Technician Master Chief (FTCM) Dan Niclas (ret.), “learn from best, what to do; learn from worst, what not to do.”

Formal leadership training in the Navy starts at the E-4 pay grade. The first exposure an enlisted person gets to leadership training is through Petty Officer Selectee Leadership Course (POSLC), which was developed to support sailors selected for Petty Officer Third Class (PO3). This training was implemented in 2006 as a requirement for unit training, and must be completed prior to a petty officer being frocked (donning the next pay grade based on selection of promotion).

The Navy’s leadership continuum builds on previous formalized training courses. E-5 (Petty Officer Second Class, PO2) and E-6 (Petty Officer First Class, PO1) sailors are required to take training on enlisted leadership development. This was developed as a result of the success of the implementation of the CPO Selectee (2007) and Petty Officer Selectee Leadership (2006) Courses. The goal is improve deck-plate leadership. This training is the responsibility of the sailor’s command to provide an opportunity to grow and develop their enlisted leadership. Again, the footprint of the CPO is evident, as stated by VADM Ferguson (CNP), “I expect Command Master Chiefs and the Chiefs’

Mess to step forward and execute this training to provide our new selectees with more effective and more relevant leadership training” (NAVADMIN 272/08, para. 1, 2008).

The requirement for Work Center Supervisor Leadership Course (WCSLC), no longer exists to participate in the E-6 advancement exam. The Petty Officer First Class Selectee Leadership Course (PO1SLC) and Petty Officer Second Class Selectee Leadership Course (PO2SLC) both include two phases. “Selectees must complete phase one of the PO1SLC/PO2SLC at their respective command prior to frocking. PO1s/PO2s will then complete phase two prior to the date of the first advancement pay increment of the respective examination cycle” (NAVADMIN 272/08, para. 5&6, 2008). These courses are designed to coincide with a sailor’s promotion (selection and advancement). By completing this training, all leadership advancement requirements will be fulfilled, as well as cost effective (local training, reduces manpower costs) for the Navy.

There are two primary leadership courses for CPO Selects and CPOs. For the CPO Selects, there is Chief Petty Officer Selectee Leadership Course (CPOSLC), which was implemented in 2007 and includes two phases. Phase one is CPO Indoctrination and phase two focuses on the CPO Mission, Vision, and Guiding Principles. The second phase presents situational scenarios that help sharpen leadership skills. The CPOSLC is mandatory for all Chief Selects prior to their frocking. For the CPO Mess, there is monthly Chief Mess Training (CMT), revised in 2007. All of these courses are provided by Naval Education and Training Command (NETC) and Center for Personal and Professional Development (CPPD), which can be found on Navy Knowledge Online (NKO).

Additionally, select CPOs, all Senior Chief Petty Officers (SCPOs), and Master Chief Petty Officers (MCPOs) who are eligible, attend the Senior Enlisted Academy (SEA) in Newport, Rhode Island. The SEA has two different curricula according to the SEA website, “the resident curriculum is a six-week course of instruction, containing 240 academic hours. The non-resident curriculum includes four to five months (108 hours) of distance learning and a two-week in-house course of instruction” (Senior Enlisted Academy, Academy Overview, para. 4, 2010).

Those selected for Command Master Chief (CMC)/Chief of the Boat Leadership Course (COBLC) must attend the CMC/COBLC prior to reporting to their first CMC/COB (Chief of the Boat) assignment. The CMC/COBLC is two weeks and is held in Newport, Rhode Island. All CMCs and COBs must complete the Senior Enlisted Academy Course (SEAC) prior to enrolling in the CMC/COBLC. Potential waivers may be granted for leadership courses, but ultimately, must be completed by the responsible individual at his/her earliest convenience.

2. Senior Enlisted Academy

The senior chief and master chief petty officer pay grades were developed as a result of many years of rank congestion, retention, and playing a larger technological role in the Cold War. The Navy's senior leadership also wanted to create an incentive to keep CPOs beyond 20 years, mainly for the valuable role they filled. In 1979, Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), Admiral (ADM) Thomas B. Hayward made monumental strides to expand the role of senior enlisted leaders. ADM Hayward saw the role of senior chiefs and master chiefs developing into a middle management position, as a replacement for senior technicians. With a shift in focus for the Navy's senior enlisted leaders, ADM Hayward and Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy (MCPON) Thomas Crow knew education and training would be essential for a successful transition from technician to middle manager. Through MCPON Crow's personal and forceful drive, the Senior Enlisted Academy (SEA) was founded in 1981. MCPON Crow believed the Senior Enlisted Academy would re-establish pride and professionalism across the fleet.

The SEA is one of the most well-respected, enlisted educational institutions for all military branches in the United States, and is the only professional military institution for the Navy's senior enlisted. The SEA is located in Newport, Rhode Island and focuses on leadership and management, communications skills, national security affairs, Navy programs, and physical readiness. The SEA trains nearly 1,200 students annually, most of which are active duty Navy. The remaining complement of students comes from other U.S. military branches (including reserves) and international service members. The SEA curriculums are mentioned in the preceding section. The SEA was built on "leadership

by example,” in keeping, largely due to the actions of “Chief Watertender Peter Tomich, who earned the Medal of Honor for his actions on the USS *Utah* (AG-16), 7 December 1941, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii” (Senior Enlisted Academy, Academy History, para. 3, 2010).

All CMCs and COBs must complete the Senior Enlisted Academy Course (SEAC) prior to reporting to their first CMC/COB assignment. This requirement was established in 1995, by CNO, ADM Jeremy Michael Boorda. According to SEA’s website, “the mission of the United States Navy Senior Enlisted Academy is to strengthen senior enlisted commitment to professional excellence and mission accomplishment through education” (Senior Enlisted Academy, Academy Mission, para. 1, 2010). The SEA’s vision is, “to be the Navy’s premier academic institution, educating tomorrow’s senior enlisted leaders” (Senior Enlisted Academy, Academy Vision, para. 1, 2010).

All participants in the present study, with the exception of one, attended the Senior Enlisted Academy. Those who pursued being a Command Master Chief or Chief of the Boat attended the CMC/COBLC, if it was available during their transition.

C. CONCLUSION OF EARNING THE GOLD FOUL ANCHORS

This chapter serves as a reminder of the complexity and fortitude it takes to earn the gold foul anchors. Understanding the board process and scrutiny that goes into the advancement of the senior enlisted leader gives a sincere appreciation of the high quality senior enlisted that the Navy produces. The average CPO dons the gold foul anchors in approximately the 12–14 years of service (YOS) range. Annual evaluations (CHIEFEVALS) and continuation boards provide the Navy with legitimate analysis tools to measure the performance of our senior enlisted, ensuring they are leading from the deck-plate. Continuous training and education creates a wealth of knowledge and provides mentoring and leadership opportunities for the CPO community, emphasizing the elite senior enlisted leadership positions that lead the Navy’s commands.

The following chapter focuses on the data analysis, extracting key leadership variables and themes that will either sustain, or possibly impede Naval Operations in the future.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

V. RESULTS

*“Nearly all men can stand adversity, but if you want to test a man's character, give him power.”
- Abraham Lincoln*

A. OVERVIEW

To understand key leadership characteristics used to complement behaviors that are frequently observed within highly effective senior enlisted leaders, interviews were conducted with diverse and highly qualified master chief petty officers (MCPO). The goal of the interviews was to gather data to better understand the workings of senior enlisted leaders and the characteristics that will sustain future Naval operations. A total of 19 MCPOs (17 active duty, two retired) were interviewed individually by means of telephone (one interview was conducted in person), varying from 45 to 100 minutes. Results were similar across the participants, but each interview presented a different perspective and experience, which led to a richer study of the senior enlisted leader.

B. THEMES

First, it is worth mentioning that these themes were recurring and reflect most of what the participants stated during the interview process, but are not all inclusive. Themes from the MCPO's interviews are described below.

1. Mission First—Sailors Are Always Imperative to Sustain Naval Operations

The Naval Personnel Command (NPC) vision was substantially endorsed by all interviewees. The MCPOs understand that mission is critical, but high quality resources (sailors) that are efficient and cost effective are necessary to accomplish the mission. The Navy must continue to recruit, retain, and build the force for tomorrow on today's bright up and coming sailors. The master chiefs that represent this study understand this all too well, as they were the talent that was fostered yesterday to be the Navy's leaders today. Today's environment is dynamic, volatile, and fast paced. The Navy must remain vigilant to the environment; it will undoubtedly remain a function of our force.

Each MCPO was humble, appreciative of his/her position, and wanted to be a part of something greater than him or herself. The data convey that each MCPO understands the total force environment that the Armed Forces operate in today. The NPC vision was endorsed in some manner, by 100 percent of the participants. This theme was evident in the statement by Fleet Master Chief (FLTCM) Scott Benning, in regard to what his experience has taught him. His statement symbolizes what each person represents in the Navy, a sailor, and as sailors we come together to accomplish the mission.

Sometimes we grow up in the enlisted community and feel like there is a black hole there. If you are an officer, you are in a black hole, and what I learned is that officers and senior enlisted people have the same desire, the same motivation, and it's about serving each other, it's about doing well; it's about making the team successful. So, there is no difference in between any of us, other than the fact that we carry different rank and different responsibilities.

2. The Chief Petty Officer (CPO) Is the Lynchpin That Binds the Officer and Enlisted Ranks

The data leave no question that the CPOs are the lynchpin that binds the officer and enlisted communities. All of the interview participants were adamant that one of the major roles for the CPO is to bridge the gap between the enlisted and officer. The CPO must connect the deck-plate with senior leadership to ensure the mission is executed in an effective manner. This theme represents the core of the Navy, which is, CPOs execute the policy and mission put forth by the officers. The CPO is not only the lynchpin between the officer and enlisted communities, but the experience and wisdom they impart is paramount in the development of the junior sailors and junior officers. The CPO is the backbone of the Navy, as the data indicate. This theme was embodied by the statement of Cryptologic Technician Collection Master Chief (CTRCM) Johnny Hutson.

Strong commands have a strong CPO Mess. They are experienced individuals with expertise and leadership skills. No matter whom you are E-1 thru O-10; the anchor is a sign of reliability and support. If taken away, a void will exist. The CPO is the lynchpin; it binds and strengthens a command.

3. The Importance of the CPO Mess Cannot Be Understated

The CPO Mess provides an enormous advantage for the Navy. The data clearly present why the CPO Mess is essential to each command and the Navy as a whole. The CPO Mess has great camaraderie and the ultimate “TEAM” (Together Everyone Accomplishes More) attitude, led by the Command Master Chief (CMDCM). Networking and utilizing other CPO resources are common practice among CPOs, ensuring the mission is accomplished. All participants (100 percent) believed the loss of the CPO Mess would be monumental and even catastrophic to Naval operations. The majority of the interviewees had confidence in the Navy’s sailors that they would persevere and find a way, as that is the way of a sailor, but a solution would not be easy and would take time to come to fruition. This theme was personified through the words of Command Master Chief (CMDCM) Jackie DiRosa when she was asked about the importance of the CPO.

I have told many people and including my Chiefs Messes this, when I have talked to them about their responsibilities and level of engagement, which is required under command—and I’ve told them, ...I can take all the officers out of the command and the job is still going to get done. I said if I take you out of the command, then we’re going to suffer—because it is not necessarily the officer’s role to do the day-to-day execution—it’s the chief’s role to do that, to train and develop our junior sailors and deliver the requirements of that command and that mission. So, you take that chief petty officer out of that picture, what ends up happening, is you create more chaos—and you know what, it will be crippling. Now, and you can see the difference when you take a command that is highly successful, whether it is an operational or shore command, you take a command that is highly successful and line them up against a command that is not—and I will tell you, nine times out of 10 the issues lie in the Chiefs Mess. If the Chiefs Mess is not engaged and not taking action, proactive action in the command, the command suffers as a whole.

One violation or derailment by any particular CPO Mess is a violation of the Mess as a whole, and is detrimental to all CPOs, Navy-wide. CPOs are supposed to be above reproach and have the utmost integrity. The CPO’s role is to lead by example 24 hours, seven days a week in every capacity. It is important to note that CPOs are people like anyone and susceptible to shortcomings, but the CPOs moral fiber and character must be second to none and one to emulate. If a CPO fails, he or she loses credibility and the

capacity to lead his or her people. This destroys unit cohesiveness; therefore hindering the mission that a CPO is appointed to execute. During a recent interview with one of the master chief participants they reflected on the consequences of poor leadership and judgment by the CPO Mess.

Failure is not an option sir, and when we fail, it is horrible. The *JAMES E. WILLIAMS* that you probably heard or read in the “Navy Times” on that is huge, for five chiefs to be admin sep due to fraternization. The CO [Commanding Officer] relieved and the CMC [Command Master Chief] to be relieved that is a failure in leadership and a failure on that Chiefs Mess, which is a black eye against all the Chiefs Mess.

Finally, the CPO Mess and the role of the CPO are unique to the U.S. Navy. Command Master Chiefs (CMDCM) and Chiefs of the Boat (COB) have unfettered access to the commanding officer and the executive officer, unlike most mid-level management positions in the civilian or private sector. The other military services do not have a role that is equivalent to the CPO, and this is evident from the example that was alluded to during an interview with one of the master chief participants.

I will tell you that the other Branches of Service don’t have what we have. As a master chief, I have direct access to a one star in the Army who calls me up and bounces things off of me—because the first time that I met her and briefed her on some stuff, she started asking my opinion, and I not only gave my opinion on the topic at hand and my opinion on some other stuff that their office held accountability and responsibility for—and her Army Sergeant Major who was sitting behind her—jaw about hit the floor and after it was all said and done, he pulled me aside and said, I can’t believe you told the general all of that. I’m like, why not? He said, in the Army, you just don’t do that—and I said, well, she opened the door.

4. Chief Petty Officers Are Ultimate Team Builders Who Train and Develop the Ranks of Today for the Future of the Navy

The data, without a doubt, provide clear evidence that the CPO rank structure is essential to growing the Navy’s ranks from within. All (100 percent) of the participants of this study understand their role as a CPO is to train and develop junior enlisted, peers (junior CPOs), and junior officers. The CPO plays a unique role in developing subordinates that eventually fill the ranks. The Navy, as in all military services, grows, trains, and develops their own talent. This talent is developed through a team

environment, predicated on education and training. The experience the CPO provides is undoubtedly the core to fostering each sailor's growth and, eventually leads those motivated sailors to realize their potential. There are various roles a CPO fills that will give him or her opportunity. As a division chief they certainly have this chance, but their role becomes more multifaceted as the level of responsibility is enhanced. The opportunities are too vast to detail in this study, but the role of the CPO can be unlimited depending on the individual and his or her desire and potential. The CPO role comes to life in the following account from one of the master chiefs represented in this study.

If you look at the CPO Creed and listen to folks talk about—MCPON [Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy] Campa really coined the term, deck-plate leaders. When he talked about that deck-plate leader that means getting out on the deck-plate, getting out from behind your desk, quit sending those e-mails out and talking to your sailors via e-mail. Get out and walk and look at them [your sailors] in the eye. My thing is that we're supposed to be visible leaders, ok—visible—we set the tone. As my SG [Surgeon General] always says to me, he says, FORCE, you've got to be out there listening to what the sailors are saying that's the job of the chief. Right now, in the Navy we've got high deployment/high suicide, we've really got some issues and that chief, whether they believe it or not, can make a difference in a young sailor's life because the sailors that are coming in today are very different than when I came in 30 years ago. You've got to be able to change your leadership style to understand the young sailors we have coming in today. They are different; what they want, they want, and they want it right now. So, that chief is that visible leader out there and I think if that is gone, you will lose something in translation.

5. Mastering the Realm of Expertise Will Lead to Credibility and Success Through Experience and Walking the Walk

The data (the majority of the interviewees) validate that a high quality leader must walk the walk and lead by example. A senior enlisted leader cannot expect his or her sailors to do something they have never done before. The experience of going down a similar career path and having done a particular task, pays enormous dividends for senior enlisted leaders when it comes to garnering respect from subordinates and understanding expectations. Being a senior enlisted leader is often predicated on credibility; the moment one's credibility is lost, they lose those they are leading. This is one of the primary reasons why the CPO is vital to the ranks of the Navy. CPOs, by and large have

the experience and technical expertise to lead a group of sailors with relative ease. There is a sense of comfort when a young sailor sees his or her chief alongside them teaching and mentoring, and possibly walking them through the task at hand, if needed. This process strengthens the CPOs credibility and sends a distinct message that the chief cares and has the knowledge and experience to lead that young sailor. Senior enlisted leaders must be ready for any challenge, and the fact that they are looked at to set the example in all facets of leadership. Master Chief Navy Diver (NDCM) Paul Balesi addressed leading by example in a simple, but rather important manner.

Leadership by example that everybody says, but it really does work, I think. I am the first guy at work in the morning and the last guy to leave—and they [sailors] will never see me out of uniform, needing a haircut, or shave. Anything like that it's automatic stuff I've carried through since military school, since I was a kid—I just make a good example for the kids.

The voice of the CPO is important; each CPO must carefully choose his or her words, as sailors listen. A senior enlisted leader's voice and actions are paramount in building his or her credibility. The CPO, like anyone can ruin his or her credibility with a slip of the tongue or an unacceptable action. The moment a CPO says something, it is “perceived” as reality, whether it is true, false or has meaning or no meaning. Command Master Chief (CMDM) Jon Port speaks about the difference between leading from behind a desk and leading by example.

I have learned through being a parent, things about how I would interact with my children and I learned over the years what was not effective—and because it wasn't effective with them, then it probably isn't any more effective with this 18 or 19 year-old sitting across from my desk, right now. So, maybe there's another approach, I found out, probably the greatest leadership attributes you can have is leadership by example. If you lead by example and really lived what you said, then sailors have a tendency to respect that and if sailors respect you, just like your parents—you don't want to disappoint them—so it meant more to look across that desk and tell the sailor, I'm not angry at you, I'm disappointed. If you ask my boys that are wearing the uniform now, they will tell you that was far worse; they just wanted me to yell at them. To tell them I was disappointed, oh my, they had to wear that badge, like forever now. That only comes if they respect you, it doesn't work if you are sitting there yelling at them every day, they don't care.

Becoming a technical expert and crafting one's skill is essential to the chief petty officer's credibility and providing sound leadership in their discipline. One study reviewed suggests this as a significant problem of the CPO Mess (Eyer, 2010). The author of this particular (thesis study) believes the decline in the level of technical expertise amongst chiefs is a product of the Navy going to Computer-based Training (CBT), leaving out the most important aspect of training and education, the personal interaction between the subject expert and the student. CBT came about as a cost effective measure and a manner that would decrease the time spent (by a sailor) in the Navy's supply (training) chain; therefore, decreasing training costs with the expectation that production (of that sailor) would remain relatively unchanged. The real question that remains is, is this method of training going to ultimately decrease the knowledge base of today and tomorrow's sailors, which will in turn deliver a significant setback to the Navy as a technically savvy organization?

Command Master Chief (CMDCM) Jon Port drives home the point about the importance of remaining a technically sound Navy in the following passage. His view was not necessarily shared by all master chiefs in this study, but it is a significant point worth mentioning in concern to the future challenges of the Navy. The underlying message CMDCM Port is conveying, is that Chiefs never used to miss an opportunity to teach, whether it was about our Naval history, terms and traditions, or about a piece of equipment. He believes the CPO must embrace this approach, regardless of the technological advances made.

I don't believe we are going to get any smaller, but we're going to have to get smarter. We're getting into a position where you know we're going to have to get back to where operator is not good enough. You can't bet on the fact that just technology will carry you and you don't have to have any knowledge whatsoever of what's in that box—just pull that box out and send it to a manufacturer that's not going to be good enough. You don't have any clue as to why that box interacts with that box, interacts with that box—that's got to be there and who leads that effort and who leads the Mess and who lead that enlisted man, it's that master chief and CMC. So, he's got to get his chief petty officers back into the books, back focused on the technology that drives our Navy—and really knowledgeable, I mean no kidding knowledgeable. If you're a warfare pin [qualified], you got a warfare pin on your chest, guess what, you checked onboard my ship and

you're going to re-qualify and I want you to re-qualify in a year and I'm going to sit the board to make sure you re-qualify. So that chiefs can be the kind of technical as well as leadership mentor to those junior sailors that are up and coming. We kind of have to go (back) full circle where we used to be. Chiefs never used to miss an opportunity to teach.

6. Smell Like a Sailor and Impart Through Nose-to-Nose Leadership

Getting back to the basics under the leadership of former Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy (MCPON) Joe Campa, has led to the resurgence of an emphasis on deck-plate leadership. Deck-plate leadership continues to be stressed under MCPON West, as is evident through the words of Command Master Chief (CMDCM) Jerry Helton, "we [chief petty officers] need to smell like our sailors." This refers to the need of the CPO being visible and engaged in the daily operations of his or her division, while providing the technical advice and sound leadership to ensure the division understands why the mission is essential.

Chief Petty Officers hold a unique leadership position, the fact that they lead in a variety of methods demonstrates their flexibility and willingness to change according to the situation. Leading down is an integral part of developing the Navy's sailors. Chiefs have an innate ability to go nose-to-nose with junior sailors. This unique leadership allows them to provide intense counseling sessions (some may refer to this as "tough love") for subordinates, which is often quite effective. The key to this nose-to-nose leadership is to pick the "precise" opportunity when the chief believes it will be most effective. Subsequently, doing this daily will generally harden a sailor's reaction (connection) to the message being sent by the chief. When this leadership is utilized it is paramount (within a short period) in building up the sailor that the chief has just torn down. This is imperative so the chief does not "lose" that particular sailor and continues to keep them motivated. Command Master Chief (CMDCM) Willie Clouse was speaking in reference to technology and the impact it has and will continue to have on leadership and the personal contact element that will remain a challenge for leaders.

I want us to keep an eye on technology—I think technology, if used right is a great asset—I'm talking dealing with people now, obviously, not weaponry or not managing ships, I'm talking us (leaders) dealing with people. I think technology can really help us and it can also hurt us. I fear

often times; technology is not being used as a communication tool, but being used to replace some form of leadership. I think there is a big concern there—especially as I told you, my earlier observation that the generation we are bringing into the military now, they want that interaction, personal contact, they want to look you in the eyeball and see what your pupils are doing. So, if I am talking to them via e-mail and scolding them or calling on a cell phone—I think I am going to lose that person as a sailor. I don't want it [technology] to replace personal interaction that leadership is responsible for delivering to people.

7. Vision, Communication, and Relationship Building Are Paramount to Leading a Strong Command

The data (the majority of the interviewees) support that relationship building and the core value it has in leading a strong command. The roles the Commanding Officer (CO), Executive Officer (XO), and CMC play in each individual command are critical in the success or failure of that command. These individuals are the leaders of the command. They set the standard and develop the climate and culture of the command to ensure a positive working environment for each sailor. Some of the most important aspects of the leadership triad are vision, communication, and the relationship building that transpires not only amongst these individuals, but also between the Wardroom and the Chiefs Mess. Some of these ideals are embodied in a passage from an interview with one of the master chief participants.

If I'm a leader, and the thing is that as a leader, as a chief, I've got to be able to be honest with my boss, my officer—and my officer needs to be able to say I need you to be honest with me and accept that criticism. Being the CMC is probably one of the loneliest positions that you have in that command—you have no friends, you shouldn't have any friends. So, you and that XO should be sitting down every morning talking to make sure you two are on the same sheet. If you're not, close the door; cuss each other out—so that when you do open that door nobody knows. The Senior Enlisted Academy [SEA] has in every room, a saying on the wall—acceptance does not always mean agreement. You may not always agree, but when you open that door you have to accept that decision that was made in that room and move forward and carry out the plan of the day. You've got to do that.

8. Innovation and the Vision to Accept Change Will Aid in Adapting to the 21st Century Navy

The data validate (the majority of interviewees) that innovation is instrumental to the future of the successes and/or failures of the Navy. Today's CPO must be willing to change, adapt, and have the vision to maximize resources. The coined phrase, "do more with less" is a reality the Navy and other militaries cannot ignore. The Navy's senior enlisted leaders must know their sailors, along with the abilities and training that will aid in carrying out the mission. Having the right person in the right job is essential. Command Master Chief (CMDM) Willie Clouse shared his views on innovation during his interview.

I don't want to use that saying that we're not suppose to use—do more with less, but it is out there, it's a tough world we are living in. I think a person that is happy with status quo and think they live in a static world—I think the world is going to leave them behind and they will quickly find themselves not relevant to what is going on. So, don't change for change sake, but change where change needs to be implemented, and we need to do it, and do it quick or we're not going to have a military of the 21st century. We need to be changing all the time. We're in a new world, technology is moving faster than we can keep up with it. By the time we pull something off the shelf and put it on ships, planes, or submarines, it is no longer relevant, it is old material—and our sailors nowadays, we're not dumping anymore responsibility on them as compared to when I was a young second class, first class, but we sure do require them to know a lot more—than say I was required to know back in the late 80s and early 90s. Leaders need to be innovative, evaluating what we're doing and making sure it remains ready, relevant, and responsive to current times.

The responses to the question, what role does innovation play in master chief leadership garnered various explanations. However, the majority of the participants said it was vital and the Navy needs to be keen on innovation and the role it will play in today and in the future. Responses focused on manpower, the economic factor, equipment, the type of wars the military will fight, technology, and numerous other innovation facets of leadership. One of the technological elements involves MCPON West on Facebook. Facebook may be an excellent tool when used correctly, but there are many dangers in cyberspace and social networking, whether one intends it to be or not. For example, terrorist harboring unpleasant intentions on the U.S. Military could intercept the location

of a particular unit through devious social networking if sailors are not keen on how they communicate. The MCPON also places an expectation on himself by communicating on Facebook, as sailors may interpret something one way and he will be held to that whether it is intended that way (this refers back to the CPO having to choose his or her words wisely). However, Facebook is a constructive tool in launching mass communications, which can be useful, as long as each chain of command is utilized appropriately.

9. Leading Up, Down, and Laterally Are Expected as a CPO

The majority of the participants in this study stated that leading laterally was the most difficult type of leadership, followed by leading up, and leading down was the easiest. Nearly all the participants said each role had challenges, but some were easier to overcome than others. By and far, understanding who one was leading was a critical factor in being successful in any capacity of these leadership roles. The following sections will give a summary of leading up, down, and laterally through the eyes of the master chief petty officer.

a. Leading Up

The data confirm that leading up requires particular people skills and communication skills to succeed at leading one's boss. Leading up is developed through years of experience and understanding the position each leader plays in the overall execution of the mission. Senior enlisted leaders must have vision to stay ahead, and the ability to utilize their influence and experience to ensure the command is heading in the right direction. For example, the Command Master Chief (CMDCM) of any Navy command has unfettered access to the commanding officer as his or her confidant. It is important that senior enlisted leaders are a sounding board and understand when to give candid recommendations to senior officers and have the courage to tell the emperor they have no clothes on. The expectations of senior officers are fierce and patience is a virtue. Leading up is most prevalent at the MCPON, FLTCM, FORCM, CMC, and COB levels. These positions are generally filled with the best talent the enlisted community has to offer, resulting in success, the majority of the time.

Leading up takes a certain craft or technique to be effective, especially within the confines of the military rank structure. This technique literally takes years to develop and master for the senior enlisted leader. For instance, as a seaman, fireman, airman, or undesignated sailor, an enlisted sailor learns to negotiate with tact. The more junior a sailor, the less negotiating and more executing of orders from superiors, such as, the Work Center Supervisor (WCS), Leading Petty Officer (LPO), LCPO (Leading Chief Petty Officer), or in seldom events, a sailor's Division Officer (DIVO). As a sailor garners more seniority the requirement for these skills becomes more of a necessity to be effective at leading up, they essentially function in parallel with each other. Furthermore, the opportunities for negotiating (with superiors) stem from requesting more liberty (time off from duty) time, ideas at work that may be more innovative to increase production, or getting involved with command responsibilities and creating a better command climate, as well as numerous other circumstances. This pattern continues as a sailor promotes to more senior pay grades to earn the gold foul anchors (in this example), eventually promoting to master chief petty officer (MCPO).

The master chief is well seasoned in all regards. He or she has earned the title master chief through knowledge, experience, and the process of aging (maturation). The master chief's only "true" (similar in age and time in service) peer is often the commanding officer (CO). The CO understands to trust his or her CMDCM (will use for this example) with substantial responsibilities. This CO/CMDCM relationship has been a component of the Navy for quite some time. The following passage provides a reference to the creation of the Command Master Chief.

In 1971 Adm. Bud Zumwalt, at the urging of MCPON Whittet, issued a "Z-gram" formalizing the program, which identified the "best and brightest" as master chief petty officers of the command (MCPOC). Twenty-three outstanding master chief petty officers were identified and assigned to major commands ashore and afloat. (Leahy, p. 134, 2004)

The official Command Master Chief (CMC) Program was initiated through OPNAVINST 1306.2C (Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction). The following excerpt gives an explanation of the duties of the CMDCM.

The Navy's Command Master Chief (CMC) Program is a valuable asset which stimulates free-flowing communications and ensures the highest standards of professionalism are upheld at all levels within the chain of command. Command Master Chiefs strengthen the chain of command by keeping the Commanding Officer aware of existing or potential situations as well as procedures and practices which affect the mission, readiness, welfare and morale of the Sailors in the command. CMCs are the senior enlisted leaders who report directly to their respective Commanding Officers. They formulate and implement policies concerning morale, welfare, job satisfaction, discipline, utilization and training of Navy personnel. By reporting directly to their Commanding Officer, the CMCs keep their chain of command aware and informed of sensitive and current issues. (OPNAVINST 1306.C, Command Master Chief Program, 1995)

Through these distinct duties (and many others), the CMDCM harnesses power, respect, and unfettered access to the commanding officer. There is a mutual respect between a CO and his or her CMDCM. Military leaders are expected to lead through sound moral leadership, which creates direct, honest feedback, and calculated recommendations. These conversations are not always pleasant, especially if these two individuals have different perspectives. An effective CMDCM can harness the power of others (CO) to his or her advantage, ensuring mission accomplishment. There is a fine line that must be tread lightly when harnessing this power. An effective CMDCM masters the art of listening and directs it in his or her favor when negotiating or making valuable recommendations.

There certainly is an art to leading up, but the fundamentals to leading up, revolve around understanding how to listen and learning to leverage one's position with the support of accurate data to influence the decisions that will be of utmost importance to the command executing the mission.

b. Leading Down

The data validate that leading down tends to be the easiest leadership role to fill for a MCPO. The majority of the master chiefs in this study felt it was rewarding leading down due to the training and development role they fulfill. Leading down is an integral part of developing the Navy's junior sailors.

Being a senior enlisted leader is often predicated on establishing credibility, the moment one's credibility is lost, they lose those they are leading. This is one of the primary reasons why the CPO is vital to the ranks of the Navy. CPOs, by and large have the experience and technical expertise to lead a group of sailors with relative ease. There is a sense of comfort when a young sailor sees his or her chief alongside them teaching and mentoring, and possibly walking them through the task at hand, if needed. This process strengthens the CPOs credibility and sends a distinct message that the chief cares and has the knowledge and experience to lead that young sailor.

Another challenge of leading down is allotting time with those junior sailors one needs to train and develop. Overcoming the demands of your time spent leading up and laterally can be detrimental to a young sailor reaching their full potential. The majority of a CPOs time may be spent in meetings with other leaders or tending to other responsibilities within a command. It is imperative that the CPO is visible and instrumental in the development of each of his or her sailors.

The 3.0 sailor can be a CPOs greatest challenge. Enlisted sailors (E-1 through E-6) are evaluated based on a grading scale according to Naval Personnel Form (NAVPERS 1616/26 – refer to Appendix O) on a scale of 1.0 to 5.0, 1.0 being the low end of the scale (performance traits - below standards) and 5.0 being the high end of the scale (performance traits - greatly exceeds standards). The 3.0 sailor is “average,” he or she “meets all 3.0 standards.” This sailor tends to do just enough to survive and to stay out of trouble. They are extremely challenging to motivate, as they see themselves progressing along with no real issues and are not terribly motivated to maximize their talent or may be limited and know that, but play the role of the 3.0 sailor to a tee. This is very frustrating for a senior enlisted leader and the Perform to Serve (PTS) program is helping alleviate this strain to some degree, according to Vice Admiral (VADM) Mark Ferguson, Chief of Naval Personnel (CNP).

The Perform to Serve program is an essential tool that allows us to provide stable and predictable manning to the fleet. It will allow us to keep a balanced force based on experience, skill sets, and seniority matched to requirements. (All Hands 2010 Calendar: A supplement to All Hands magazine, June 2010)

Bringing others (lower pay grades) with you is seen as leaving no one behind as a senior enlisted leader. The philosophy behind leading down in this manner is that as a leader you will do whatever is necessary within your power to get a shipmate to follow you and impart knowledge to them. This is all part of the growing process as a young sailor.

The Navy has over 60 different ratings amongst its enlisted ranks. Some ratings require a higher aptitude for technical expertise and so forth, while others require more hands on training and familiarity with various types of equipment. The data suggest that different ratings may require different leadership styles due to the propensity of different personalities and characteristics that may lead a sailor to choose a particular rating. Leaders that tend to be more cerebral lead in a manner that is controlled through intellect, often challenging their subordinates to understand why a certain action is necessary or not. Adversely, those leaders in lower aptitude ratings tend to be charismatic and lead by example (through actions), but may lack the deep intellect of those in the technical ratings. However, there are many examples of leaders having intellect and charisma, which gives a leader more tools in their toolbox while leading.

*c. **Leading Laterally***

Greater than 50 percent of the master chiefs in this study stated that leading laterally is the most difficult type of leadership. Leading laterally for a master chief entails mentoring and training other CPOs and junior officers. This leadership can be difficult for a number of reasons, some of which are: junior CPOs believe they have arrived (don't have to work as hard or listen since they are now a CPO, these CPOs learn the difficult way or in some extremes are lost), there are various personalities and experiences, and understanding how to motivate each can be a serious challenge, and finally, many of the mid-grade and junior officers do not take counsel or hear the message (tough situation due to rank structure).

A chief is held to a higher standard and the rules apply even more. They must understand the big picture of the command they serve in and it is even more beneficial if they have a firm appreciation of the geo-political situation the United States

faces each day. As a chief, one is a senior enlisted leader that has earned the right to be called a chief. It is imperative that as a chief, you remain true to your roots and remember what got you where you are today. This is important as it will give greater support to your chain of command and your input as a chief will be more valued by your peers, especially your MCPON, FLTCM, FORCM, CMC, or COB, making their life less painful. These upper echelon leaders build their CPO Messes on communication, experience, and the resources each CPO brings to the Mess.

Today's Navy faces a dynamic and ever-changing environment. The Navy needs chiefs that are willing to adapt and remain flexible to whatever challenges come their way. Old habits die hard, but that does not mean an old dog cannot learn a new trick or two. As a leader, having the ability to be flexible and willing to accept change is paramount in the environment of the world today. Innovation will be a key to the future, and the Navy's CPOs must be aligned with these strategies that will be vital to sustaining Naval operations. All these factors enable the Navy's senior enlisted to be unique and highly effective leaders. Officers and chiefs must complement their senior enlisted leader counterparts to make the ease of leading laterally more effective for each command. Combining these assets will only increase the likelihood of aligning each command's goals with their mission, making efficiencies more practical to realize.

To gain a better understanding of how the master chief thinks in regards to leadership, here is a brief, but robust statement from Command Master Chief (CMD CM) Michael Stevens, "if we want to be extraordinary leaders, we must be uncommon ourselves; do those things not typically seen, driven by self discipline."

C. SUMMARIZING THE RESULTS

This chapter addressed the themes that were developed through listening to the interviews and extracting the key elements of each interview that were important to the uniqueness of the CPO and enriching this study. These themes were evident in the majority of the interviews conducted. However, there are more themes that could have been extracted with all the vast experience and years of service these high quality master chiefs brought this study. The summary, conclusion, and recommendations for this study will follow in the subsequent chapter.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

“A leader takes people where they want to go. A great leader takes people where they don't necessarily want to go but ought to be.” – Rosalynn Carter

A. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine unique and innovative leadership characteristics of the senior enlisted leader with a focus on master chief petty officers (MCPO). The data were generated through utilizing a qualitative methodology of in-depth interviews with 19 master chiefs that were deemed particularly successful. The majority of the participants were Command Master Chiefs (CMDCM) tallying over 504 years of total service and 144 years at the rank of Master Chief Petty Officer (MCPO). The following is a summary of the major findings from the interviews, revolving around unique and innovative characteristics.

1. Command First, Person Second

- The Navy is the ultimate team, led by various levels of senior officers that create and direct the strategy for the senior enlisted to execute (carry out the mission).
- Through this relationship a team is built with multiple layers and functions. The most applicable team to this particular study is a command.
- The data show that chief petty officers (CPO) understand the importance of command first, person second. They are the team builders within each command, led by the Command Master Chief.

2. The CPO Mess Is the Core of the Navy

- The chief petty officer is the lynchpin that binds the officer and enlisted ranks; he or she is the direct connection from the deck-plate to senior leadership.
- The CPO's wealth of knowledge, experience, and innovative vision are crucial in leading from the front as the driving force of the Navy.
- The camaraderie and unlimited networking of CPOs are an immeasurable advantage for the Navy.

3. Deck-Plate Leaders

- Deck-plate leadership will continue to be vital in connecting the junior sailors with the Navy's strategic vision and mission, through the guidance of the CPO.
- The CPO must be visible and engaged in the daily operations of his or her division, while providing the technical advice and sound leadership to ensure the division understands why the mission is essential.
- Leadership by example is a must for CPOs, as this helps build credibility through actions and re-enforces their ability as leaders and technical experts.

4. Experience and Age Lead to Seasoned Leaders

- As a senior enlisted leader, the CPO is afforded a unique leadership position with the expectation of leading up, down, and laterally
- In a leading up capacity, the MCPON, Fleet Master Chiefs (FLTCM), Force Master Chiefs (FORCM), Command Master Chiefs (CMDCM), and Chief of the Boats (COB), which are regarded as premier senior enlisted billets, have unfettered access to either a Flag-Officer (FO) or the Commanding Officer (CO) at their respective commands.
- Leading down, CPOs, led by the CMDCM are charged with developing, training, and mentoring junior enlisted sailors as well as junior officers. The CPO's experience and knowledge plays a significant role in earning credibility and respect. The nose-to-nose leadership implemented with the junior enlisted sailor is paramount in developing each sailor's potential.
- Leading laterally, the data show this is the most difficult style of leadership for the CPO. Leading peers, junior officers, and mid-grade officers can be an unappreciated task. It is imperative that each CPO, junior officer, and mid-grade officer endorses the command vision and mission, to ensure leadership is aligned.
- The average CPO earns the gold foul anchors around the 12–14 years of service (YOS) mark, positioning him or her well for the role as a senior enlisted leader.
- This time spent earning the gold foul anchors is essential in providing experience as well as development and maturity and honing technical skills that will be crucial when leading as a CPO.

B. CONCLUSION

There have been very few studies on the unique and innovative leadership of the chief petty officer (CPO) of the United States Navy. The chief petty officer has been a tremendous advantage in the Navy for nearly 117 years. The data reveal that chief petty officers are exceptional leaders at implementing their vast experience and knowledge, which enables them to adapt to numerous challenges while leading up, down, and laterally. The CPO has earned the respect of superiors through visionary and candid recommendations, leading up; the respect of peers through brotherhood/sisterhood and earned credibility, leading laterally; and the respect of subordinates through deck-plate leadership and mentoring, leading down. All of these unique and innovative characteristics of senior enlisted leaders will be critical in preparing for and solving the future challenges.

1. Future Challenges for Leadership

An important aspect of this study is the future challenges that the senior enlisted leaders of the Navy will face. The data did not support any overwhelming theme in reference to future challenges; however, one likely challenge places the Armed Forces as the nucleus to solving the geo-political disputes. The senior enlisted leader will become even more critical with force shaping and smart ships on the horizon.

Force shaping will create the need for more senior operators, with less manpower to accomplish the mission. Decreasing manpower leads to constraints that need to be given serious consideration. Implementing smart technology onboard Navy ships will reduce personnel that are required to man a ship. However, there are further considerations. For example, crisis situations such as engineering main space fires onboard a Navy ship. Where does the ship get the manning to fight the fire when technology fails? Such issues will make the leader's job even more vital and more difficult, requiring them to be more resourceful.

Command Master Chief (CMD CM) Michael Stevens gave a detailed description of his thoughts on the future challenges for senior enlisted leadership. His statement

alludes to both the fiscal and manpower challenges that lie ahead to ensure the Navy is winning through efficiencies and effectiveness. A few excerpts from his comments follow:

I believe the Navy is at a crossroads and I believe that our fiscal environment has expedited or forced this crossroad to come sooner than it otherwise would have, but I believe there is going to be a need to have a fundamental change in how we use our resources.

Pareto principal is the 80/20 rule where they say, 20 percent of people typically do 80 percent of the work. I believe in the military because of the requirements just to get in and the training we receive, it is probably more 30/70. But I believe there is going to be a need to significantly increase the capabilities and the work ethic of each individual, not just in the Navy, but the Armed Forces, so that we can survive as a Service and I believe that is going to be one of the significant challenges we face.

What we have to look at are those other 80 percent that have an average to marginal career. How do we get those people to elevate their game through positive influence, creative leadership and more efficiency? There is going to have to be more of a fundamental change in how we approach this, how we train to it—how we create that climate and culture within our organization. So even if it means getting five or 10 percent more out of everything we do, we've got to find a way to elevate because we're no longer going to win through attrition and numbers—we're going to win through efficiencies and effectiveness.

Superior leaders will be required to deal with the increase in smart ship technology and Littoral Combat Ships (LCS), force shaping. Less manpower is not always a good thing. Senior enlisted leaders must find a way to elevate the productivity of the sailors they are charged with leading to ensure the smart ship technology and LCS platforms are a success. If the Navy is not willing to assess and challenge technology through the latest innovation, they will neglect leveraging the capabilities that are available to improve the overall efficiencies of their force.

2. Recruiting and Leading the Millennials

Recruiting and retention are always a considerable challenge. The recent fiscal environment has led to better recruiting and retention of sailors. With the uncertainty of the economy, the Navy's retention may remain at or above acceptable levels. Retention

is as high as it has been in recent years, but at some point the Navy will have to release quality people due to force shaping. This is a good thing for the Navy as long as the short-term plan coincides with the long-term metrics that will produce quality force shaping.

Recruiting and retention is linked to leading the Millennials into the 21st century. One of the primary questions policy makers need to ask is, can we keep Millennials' interests and will they want to serve for 20–30 years in the same industry? The Navy will welcome many of these Millennials to attrite at some point, due to manpower restraints, but even that small percentage that may consider a career may present a challenge for future planners and leaders of the Navy. As this study has alluded to several times, leaders must understand their people and the particular assets and talents they offer, which will elevate production, efficiencies, and ultimately mission accomplishment. Leaders must also be willing to change and be innovative. The following excerpt is from Dr. Paul Voss, who wrote the forward for *Gap Odyssey* by Mark D. Malis. He references survival and adaptation, and ties in technology with the role it plays in changing as an organization.

Charles Darwin's famous book *On the Origin of Species* (1859) introduced the concept of evolution to the English speaking world. In this book, Darwin stressed the link between adaptation and survival. Darwin did not speak of the survival of the strongest; if strength and strength alone mattered, the huge dinosaurs would still roam the earth. Darwin rather postulated the survival of the fittest, those organisms (or corporations) with the agility and the ability to adapt to and with the changing environments.

The history of business in the United States is full of once-vital corporations who failed to adapt, companies that remained chained to a certain way of doing business with a certain technology, serving a fixed market. Many of these corporations no longer exist. But markets, as we know, change—they move and evolve. As a result, so must companies. Naturally, so must the workforce and those managers who lead the workforce. In this new environment, managers must often make the first and most conspicuous moves. (*Gap Odyssey*, p. xii, 2009)

The willingness to adapt and change are obvious considerations for future Naval operations; however, the military must tread lightly, as the rules and regulations of the

military are different than most civilian and private sector companies. Understanding what motivates a Millennial is certainly a step in the right direction, but changing an organization (such as the Navy) to adhere to a generation would be disastrous. The Navy must be flexible but as history has shown, there are individuals with particular characteristics (personalities) that have a greater propensity to volunteer for military service. These individuals exist in every generation, as has been proven through maintaining an All-Volunteer Force (AVF) since 1973.

Master Chiefs must continue to lead from the front with unique and innovative leadership. For this to occur, the Navy's senior enlisted leadership must remain keen to what motivates the Millennials and understand how to leverage their numerous talents to contribute to mission-readiness. The Navy's leaders must be willing to adapt to the Millennials, but ensure the core and structure of the Navy remains focused on the mission and vision of the Navy, as an organization.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

The data for this study were compiled through in-depth interviews with participation from selected master chiefs that were regarded as particularly successful. Quite possibly, further research on a larger scale may give more detailed insight into the unique and innovative characteristics of master chief petty officers. Specific recommendations follow.

1. Creation of the E-10 Pay Grade

The military currently has an enlisted rank structure from E-1 through E-9, with a maximum years of service completed, otherwise known as high-year tenure (HYT), of 30 years for E-9 (Master Chiefs). Master Chiefs, as stated previously, comprise less than 1 percent of the Navy enlisted force. Based on the data of this study, the creation of the E-10 pay grade for approximately .50 percent of the enlisted force may produce an incentive for senior enlisted leaders. Out of an estimated 2800 master chiefs, 750 are Command Master Chiefs, making up approximately 27 percent of master chiefs in the Navy. This would give the Navy an opportunity to reward those master chiefs that take on the top senior enlisted leadership positions. These positions that would be eligible for

the E-10 pay grade could include: MCPON, FLTCMs, FORCMs, CMDCMs, and COBs. The enlisted service member would have to have had at least one successful tour in one of these positions to retain the E-10 pay grade. If the master chief's tour was not deemed successful for any reason, he or she would revert back to E-9. Creation of the E-10 pay grade would have a trickle-down effect that would open, albeit (very few) opportunities down the rank structure but it may be enough opportunity to keep that talented sailor who otherwise would have departed the Navy. It may also allow some of the Navy's more talented chiefs to extend their career, enabling the Navy to tap into that seasoned leadership to benefit the entire force. The remaining details would be deferred to policy makers.

2. Education on the Uniqueness of the CPO

The Navy needs to do a better job of educating all officers and enlisted on the value of the chief petty officer. These individuals are impressive and will continue to be the core of our Navy. CPOs have many vast experiences and knowledge, and the leadership value each CPO brings with he or she is immeasurable. Chief Petty Officers truly are unique and innovative; they are arguably one of the Navy's most valuable resources. Ideally common practice, when an officer is asked a question by a junior sailor, should be the question, "have you asked your chief?"

3. Future Research

Training and education of the senior enlisted, with a primary focus on the affect of Computer-based Training (CBT) on technical knowledge of the CPO, should be studied. One could go about this study from a 360-degree feedback perspective using survey data from peers, superiors, and subordinates. The rationale would be to ask pertinent questions that apply directly to the technical leadership of the CPO from the perspective of each group (peers, superiors, and subordinates). This study would be limited to technical ratings. A second study should focus on the impact of the LCS Navy and smart ship technology on deck-plate leadership.

D. FINAL REMARKS

In closing, the usefulness of this study lies in helping all sailors (officer and enlisted) who want greater knowledge about senior enlisted leadership, specifically the master chief petty officer. Master chief petty officers are particularly unique and innovative. They are the elite of the enlisted sailor, instrumental in policy decisions, and leaders from the deck-plate (leading down) to the rank of admiral (leading up). Moreover, they care about the welfare of their country, their sailors, and represent the Navy core values – honor, courage, and commitment. The chief petty officer has been the “glue” to the world’s most dominating Navy for nearly 117 years. The importance of the CPO role is as critical today, if not more than it was in 1893.

APPENDIX A. MASTER CHIEF DIROSA'S CREDENTIALS

Master Chief Jacqueline DiRosa was instrumental in identifying the participants of this study. She is currently the Command Master Chief for Navy Information Operations Command (NIOC) Suitland, her seventh tour as a CMC. Her previous billet and career experiences are the primary factors that qualify her to assist in such a manner. CMC DiRosa's preceding billet was the director of the newly (at the time) established CMC Management Office. She was asked, by then, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy (MCPON) (Jul 2006–Dec 2008) Joe Campa to stand-up the office. The basis for creating this job was to assist in reducing biased selection of FORCMs/FLTCMs and other "Flag Level" CMCs to ensure equal opportunities were given to all qualified candidates. The primary purpose of this office was to coordinate CMC slating for all Flag/General Officer (FO/GO) CMC assignments, and provide a list of eligible and qualified candidates for consideration. This centralized a function that was previously done at the local command level and offered little community visibility to processes and selection; therefore, routinely led to an assumption that selection for top assignments was based on "who you know." A large majority of Master Chief DiRosa's job consisted of "career counseling," developing an understanding of the personal career desires of each CMC, their strengths/weaknesses, career goals, as well as providing appropriate recommendations to aid in attaining career milestones while taking on challenging assignments. The intent was to develop a much needed "succession plan" for major commands and FO/GO level assignments. Standing-up the CMC Management Office lasted two years, eventually succumbing, due to less than adequate financial backing.

Master Chief DiRosa also served as the Bureau of Medicine (BUMED) FORCM as well as US Fleet Forces Command (USFF) FLTCM during two previous assignments. During these three particular tours mentioned, she worked in some capacity with each of the participants of the study. She has in-depth knowledge of each participant's leadership, behavior, and desire to professionally develop subordinates. However, with all of the advantages Master Chief DiRosa brings to the study, using her as the primary source of identifying potential participants also introduces a potential bias. Master Chief

DiRosa's distinguished and lengthy career has afforded her many experiences; however, this study is limited by who she has served with and her biases toward certain individuals, as we all have inherent biases whether we want to admit them or not. Master Chief DiRosa selected from a diverse number of personnel with a vast amount of experience, which helped reduce the selection bias.

APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW FORMAT AND QUESTIONS

Primary Questions:

Theme 1. Background

Start the Interview with an open ended softball (where were you born and raised):

What attracted you to the Navy and what has your journey been like on your way to becoming a MC, also ask for rate?

- 1) Have you been a CMC or COB?
- 2) How long have you been in the military?

Theme 2: Courses

- 1) Have you taken any leadership courses while on active duty? If so, which ones and how have they helped?
- 2) What were the most important takeaways for you from these courses?

Theme 3: Leadership

- 1) What is the importance of chief petty officers to the Navy? What would be lost if this reporting structure would somehow go away?
- 2) What life experiences, education, athletics, parents, on the job training, etc. have had the most effect on forming your approach to leadership?
- 3) What characteristics/skills do you believe are essential to being a successful leader in the senior enlisted ranks? What does it take to be a successful senior enlisted leader?
- 4) What role does innovation play in MC leadership?
- 5) Did you have any master chiefs that you looked up to as role models? What characteristics did they display that you thought were most effective?
- 6) Leadership typically involves managing up, working laterally with peers, and leading down. Please think about how a MC leads up, down, and laterally. What have been the challenges of leading up, down, and sideways? Which has been the most challenging for you and what techniques have you learned that seem to be the most helpful in influencing each of these groups, especially those over whom you have no real authority?

- 7) If you have experience as a CMC, COB, or in the capacity of another leadership position that is similar, what have you found most helpful in working with officer leadership, so it was effective for both you and the command?
- 8) Can you give any more insight into the secrets behind the chief petty officer community and how they actually get the job done as the enlisted leaders of the Navy?
- 9) How much of being a successful master chief can be learned and how much do you think is innate due to a person's personality?

Theme 4: Industry Analog

- 1) Is there an equivalent to the MC in the civilian sector? How do you feel MC's differ from civilian counterparts?

Theme 5: Career Development

- 1) What jobs have been career enhancing for you? What jobs do you feel are looked upon as the best for career enhancement?
- 2) What advice do you have for someone that wants to become a MC?
- 3) What is most important for moving up the career ladder for senior enlisted folks? What is most likely to derail them?

Theme 6: Future Challenges

- 1) What are the main differences if any, you see in today's CPO vs. when you first came into the Navy from a leadership perspective and the role they fulfill?
- 2) What challenges do you foresee senior enlisted leadership facing as the Navy changes?

Conclusion

- 1) Would you like to add any further comments or suggestions or do you have any questions for us/me?

Secondary Questions:

- 1) Do you have any suggestions on literature for me to review that may give me a richer understanding of leadership and/or senior enlisted leadership?

APPENDIX C. 1893 RATING BADGES AND INSIGNIA FOR CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS



1893 Chief Master at Arms rating badge for white clothing. This style was worn by Chief Master at Arms from 1893 through 1894. for white clothing.



1893-1894 Chief Petty Officer rating badge without a specialty mark for white clothing. A specialty mark was added depending on the rate. The eagle was white for blue clothing.



1893 Chief Petty Officer cap device worn by chief petty officers from 1893-1897. The same device was worn by first class petty officer prior to the establishment of the Chief Petty Officer rating in 1893.

Adapted from "Goat Locker website; CPO Resources; General Order No. 409," by direction of executive order, 1893.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX D. CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF OCTOBER 1949

Executive Order 10122--Regulations governing payment of disability retirement pay, hospitalization, and re-examination of members and former members of the uniformed services

Source: The provisions of Executive Order 10122 of Apr. 14, 1950, appear at 15 FR 2173, 3 CFR, 1949-1953 Comp., p. 313, unless otherwise noted.

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 414(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, approved October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Congress), and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, I hereby prescribe the following regulations governing payment of disability retirement pay, hospitalization, and re-examination of members and former members of the uniformed services:

Section 1. The terms "uniformed services" and "Secretary" as used in these regulations shall have the meaning prescribed therefore by subsections (a) and (f), respectively, of section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Sec. 2. (a) Effective as of October 1, 1949, all duties, powers, and functions incident to the payment of disability retirement pay of members or former members of the uniformed services retired for physical disability or receiving disability retirement pay shall, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, be vested in the Secretary concerned. (b) Effective July 1, 1950, all duties, powers, and functions exercised by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to Executive Order No. 8099 of April 28, 1939, as amended by Executive Order No. 8461 of June 28, 1940, relative to the administration of the retirement-pay provisions of section 1 of the act of August 30, 1935, as amended by section 5 of the act of April 3, 1939, 53 Stat. 557, and amendments thereof, shall, as to cases within their respective jurisdictions, be vested in the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, and thereafter the Veterans' Administration shall not be

charged in any case with any further responsibility in the administration of the said retirement-pay provisions. The said Executive Order No. 8099 as amended by the said Executive Order No. 8461 is hereby amended accordingly.

Sec. 3. All duties, powers, and functions incident to the hospitalization, except as provided in section 5 of this order, and re-examination of members of the uniformed services placed on the temporary disability retired list under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 shall be vested in the Secretary concerned.

[Sec. 3 amended by EO 10400 of Sept. 27, 1952, 17 FR 8648, 3 CFR, 1949-1953 Comp., p. 900]

Sec. 4. Effective May 1, 1950, all duties, powers, and functions incident to the hospitalization of members or former members of the uniformed services permanently retired for physical disability or receiving disability retirement pay shall, except as provided in section 5 of this order, be vested in the Secretary concerned: *Provided*, that all the duties, powers, and functions incident to hospitalization which such members or former members are entitled to and elect to receive in facilities of the Veterans' Administration, other than hospitals under the jurisdiction of the uniformed services, shall be vested in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Sec. 5. All duties, powers, and functions incident to the hospitalization of members or former members of the uniformed services placed on the temporary disability retired list or permanently retired for physical disability or receiving disability retirement pay who require hospitalization for chronic diseases shall be vested in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs: *Provided*, that all the duties, powers, and functions incident to hospitalization for such members or former members who elect to receive hospitalization in uniformed services facilities shall, subject to the availability of space and facilities and the capabilities of the medical and dental staff, be vested in the Secretary concerned: *And provided further*, that for the purpose of this order, the term 'chronic diseases' shall be construed to include chronic arthritis, malignancy, psychiatric or neuropsychiatric disorder, neurological disabilities, poliomyelitis with disability residuals and degenerative

diseases of the nervous system, severe injuries to the nervous system including quadriplegics, hemiplegics, and paraplegics, tuberculosis, blindness and deafness requiring definitive rehabilitation, major amputees, and such other diseases as may be so defined jointly by the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the Federal Security Administrator and so described in appropriate regulations of the respective departments and agencies concerned. Executive Order No. 9703 of March 12, 1946, prescribing regulations relating to the medical care of certain personnel of the Coast Guard, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (formerly Coast and Geodetic Survey), Public Health Service, and the former Lighthouse Service, is hereby amended to the extent necessary to conform to the provisions of this section.

[Sec. 5 amended by EO 10400 of Sept. 27, 1952, 17 FR 8648, 3 CFR, 1949-1953 Comp., p. 900; EO 11733 of July 30, 1973, 38 FR 20431, 3 CFR, 1971-1975 Comp., p. 792]

Sec. 6. Except as provided in section 5 hereof with respect to hospitalization for chronic diseases, nothing in this order shall be construed to affect the duties, powers, and functions of the Public Health Service with respect to hospitalization and medical examination of members and former members of the Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (formerly Coast and Geodetic Survey) under the Public Health Service Act, approved July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, and the regulations prescribed by the said Executive Order No. 9703 of March 12, 1946.

[Sec. 6 amended by EO 11733 of July 30, 1973, 38 FR 20431, 3 CFR, 1971-1975 Comp., p. 792]

Sec. 7. Nothing in this order shall be construed to affect the duties, powers, and functions vested in the Administrator of Veteran's Affairs pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 24, 1928, entitled "An Act making eligible for retirement, under certain conditions, officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War" (45 Stat. 735, as amended), or by or pursuant to the act of September 26,

1941, entitled "An Act to provide retirement pay and hospital benefits to certain Reserve officers, Army of the United States, disabled while on active duty" (55 Stat. 733).

Adapted from "Career Compensation Act of 1949," 1949.

APPENDIX E. INSIGNIA OF MASTER CHIEF PETTY OF THE NAVY (MCPON)

Sleeve



The rating badge consisting of a silver eagle (“crow”) atop three inverted gold chevrons and rocker, and three inverted gold stars above the eagle. The MCPON's rating specialty mark is replaced by a single inverted gold star.

Collar



The MCPON adds a third silver star above the gold anchor on his or her collar and cap devices.

Badge



He or she will also wear the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy Badge on his uniform.

Adapted from “Wikipedia, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy.” 2010.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX F. CHRONOLOGY OF MASTER CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS OF THE NAVY (MCPON)

No.	Name	Tenure
1	MCPON Delbert Black	1/13/1967 thru 01/4/1971
2	MCPON(NAC/CAC) John "Jack" Whittet	1/4/1971 thru 9/25/1975
3	MCPON Robert Walker	9/25/1975 thru 9/28/1979
4	MCPON(NAC) Thomas S. Crow	9/28/1979 thru 10/1/1982
5	MCPON(NAC) Billy C. Sanders	10/1/1982 thru 10/4/1985
6	MCPON(SW) William H. Plackett	10/4/1985 thru 9/9/1988
7	MCPON(AW/NAC) Duane R. Bushey	9/9/1988 thru 8/28/1992
8	MCPON(SW/PJ) John Hagan	8/28/1992 thru 3/27/1998
9	MCPON(SS/SW/AW) James L. Herdt	3/27/1998 thru 4/22/2002
10	MCPON(SS/AW) Terry D. Scott	4/22/2002 thru 7/10/2006
11	MCPON(SW/FMF) Joe R. Campa	7/10/2006 thru 12/12/2008
12	MCPON(SS/SW) Rick D. West	12/12/2008 thru present

Adapted from "Wikipedia, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy." 2010.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX G. MCPON LEADERSHIP MESS (FLEET, FORCE, AND COMMAND MASTER CHIEFS)

OPNAVINST 1306.2E
13 Feb 08

MCPON Leadership Mess Fleet, Force and Command Master Chiefs

<u>DESIG</u>	<u>HQTRS NAME</u>
MCPON	Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy
FLEET	Commander, U.S. Fleet Forces
FLEET	Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe/
	Commander, Allied Joint Forces Command
FLEET	Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet
FLEET	Manpower, Personnel, Training and Education
FORCE	Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
FORCE	Commander, Naval Air Forces/
	Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet
FORCE	Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet
FORCE	Commander, Naval Education and Training Command
FORCE	Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
FORCE	Commander, Naval Network Warfare Command
FORCE	Commander, Naval Special Warfare Command
FORCE	Commander, Naval Surface Forces/
	Commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet
FORCE	Commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet
FORCE	Commander, Navy Expeditionary Combat Command
FORCE	Commander, Navy Installations Command
FORCE	Commander, Navy Personnel Command
FORCE	Commander, Navy Recruiting Command
FORCE	Commander, Navy Reserve Forces
FORCE	Commander, Submarine Forces/
	Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet
FORCE	Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet
CMDCM	Chief of Naval Operations (OPNAV) (DNS)
CMDCM	Commander, Carrier Strike Group FIVE/CTF 70
CMDCM	Commander, Expeditionary Strike Group TWO/CTF 59
CMDCM	Commander, Expeditionary Strike Group SEVEN/CTF 76
CMDCM	Commander, First Naval Construction Division/
	Commander, Naval Construction Force Command
CMDCM	Commander, Fleet and Industrial Supply Center San Diego
CMDCM	Commander, Logistics Group, Western Pacific/CTF 73
CMDCM	Commander, Mid Atlantic Regional Maintenance Center
CMDCM	Commander, Military Sealift Command
CMDCM	Commander, Naval Air Systems Command
CMDCM	Commander, Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division
CMDCM	Commander, Naval Personnel Development Command
CMDCM	Commander, Naval Safety Center

Enclosure (2)

Adapted from "OPNAVINST 1306.2E, Command Master Chief Program." 2008.

OPNAVINST 1306.2E
13 Feb 08

CMDCM	Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command
CMDCM	Commander, Naval Service Training Command
CMDCM	Commander, Naval Strike and Air Warfare Center
CMDCM	Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Exchange Services Command
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Expeditionary Logistics Support Group
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Medicine East/ Commander, Naval Medical Center, Portsmouth
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Medicine National Capitol Area/ Commander, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Medicine West/ Commander, Naval Medical Center, San Diego
CMDCM	Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Japan
CMDCM	Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Korea
CMDCM	Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Marianas
CMDCM	Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Central Command/ Commander, FIFTH Fleet
CMDCM	Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Southern Command
CMDCM	Commander, Naval District Washington
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Region Europe
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Region Hawaii
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Region Mid-Atlantic
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Region Midwest
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Region Northwest
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Region Southeast
CMDCM	Commander, Navy Region Southwest
CMDCM	Commander, Operational Test and Evaluation Force
CMDCM	Commander, Patrol and Reconnaissance Group
CMDCM	Commander, Patrol and Reconnaissance Force FIFTH/SEVENTH Fleets
CMDCM	Commander, SECOND Fleet
CMDCM	Commander, SEVENTH Fleet
CMDCM	Commander, THIRD Fleet
CMDCM	Commander, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command
CMDCM	Commander, Submarine Group NINE
CMDCM	Commander, Submarine Group SEVEN/CTF 54 and 74
CMDCM	Commander, Submarine Group TEN
CMDCM	Commander, Submarine Group TWO
CMDCM	Commanding General, Marine Forces Command
CMDCM	Commanding General, Marine Forces Pacific
CMDCM	Commanding General, Marine Forces Reserves
CMDCM	Commanding General, I Marine Expeditionary Force
CMDCM	Commanding General, II Marine Expeditionary Force
CMDCM	Commanding General, III Marine Expeditionary Force

Adapted from "OPNAVINST 1306.2E, Command Master Chief Program." 2008.

OPNAVINST 1306.2E
13 Feb 08

CMDCM	Command Master Chief Detailer (PERS-40FF)
CMDCM	Command Master Chief Management Office
CMDCM	Naval Inspector General
CMDCM	Naval War College
CMDCM	Program Executive Office, Ships
CMDCM	Program Executive Office, Subs
CMDCM	Senior Enlisted Academy
CMDCM	Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy

Note: CMDCM's selected to serve in COCOM will have their rating changed to FLTCM. Both COCOM and major JTF Senior Enlisted positions will be included as members of the MCPON Leadership Mess for the period of their tours.

Adapted from "OPNAVINST 1306.2E, Command Master Chief Program." 2008.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX H. OCCUPATIONAL FIELDS AND ASSOCIATED RATINGS

1. Administration (LN, NC, PC, PS, RP, YN)
2. Air Traffic Control (AC)
3. Aviation Ground Support (ABE, ABF, ABH, AS)
4. Aviation Maintenance/Weapons (AD, AE, AM, AME, AO, AT, AZ, PR)
5. Aviation Sensor Operations (AW)
6. Communications (IT)
7. Construction (BU, CE, CM, EA, EO, SW, UT)
8. Cryptology (CTI, CTM, CTN, CTR, CTT)
9. General Seamanship (BM)
10. Health Care (HM)
11. Intelligence (IS)
12. Law Enforcement/Security (MA)
13. Logistics (CS, SH, SK)
14. Marine Engineering (EM, EN, GSE, GSM, IC, MM)
15. Media (MC)
16. Meteorology and Oceanography (AG)
17. Music (MU)
18. Ordnance Systems (GM, MN, MT)
19. Sensor Operations (STG, STS)
20. Ship Maintenance (DC, HT, MR)
21. Ship Operations (OS, QM)

22. Special Warfare/Diving (EOD, ND, SB, SO)

23. Weapons Control (ET, FC, FT)

Adapted from, "Manual of Navy Enlisted Manpower and Personnel Classifications and Occupations Standards, Volume 1. Navy Enlisted Occupational Standards (NAVPERS 18068F). Appendix B Occupational Fields and Associated Ratings." by Navy Personnel Command 2010.

APPENDIX I. ENLISTED RATINGS



AB
Aviation Boatswain's Mate
ABE – Equipment
ABF – Fuel
ABH – Handling



AS
Air-Traffic Controller



AD
Aviation Machinist's Mate



AE
Aviation Electrician's Mate



AG
Aerographer's Mate



AM
Aviation Structural Mechanic
AME – Equipment



AO
Aviation Ordnanceman



AS
Aviation Support Equipment
Technician



AT
Aviation Electronics Technician



AW
Naval Air Crewmen



AZ
Aviation Maintenance
Administrationman



BM
Boatswain's Mate



BU
Builder



CE
Construction Electrician



CM
Construction Mechanic



CS
Culinary Specialist



CT

Cryptologic Technician
CTI - Interpretive
CTM - Maintenance
CTN - Networks
CTR - Collection
CTT - Technical



DC

Damage Controlman



EA

Engineering Aide



EM

Electrician's Mate



EN

Engineman



EO

Equipment Operator



EOD

Explosive Ordnance
Disposal



ET

Electronics Technician



FC

Fire Controlman



FT

Fire Control Technician



GM

Gunner's Mate



GS

Gas Turbine System



HM

Hospital Corpsman



HT

Hull Maintenance
Technician



IC

Interior Communications
Electrician



IS

Intelligence
Specialist



IT

Information Systems Technician



LN

Legalman



LS*

Logistics Specialist



MA

Master-at-Arms



MC

Mass Communication Specialist



MM

Machinist's Mate



MN

Mineman



MR

Machinery Repairmen



MT
Missile Technician



MU
Musician



NC
Navy Counselor



ND
Navy Diver



OS
Operations Specialist



PC*
Postal Clerk



PR
Aircraft Survival
Equipmentman



PS
Personnel Specialist



QM
Quartermaster



RP
Religious Programs
Specialist



SB
Special Warfare Boat
Operator



SH
Ship's Serviceman



SK*
Storekeeper



SO
Special Warfare Operator



ST
Sonar Technician
STG – Surface
STS – Submarine



SW
Steelworker



UT
Utilitiesman



YN
Yeoman



AN**
Airman



FN**
Fireman



SN**
Seaman

*The LS rating was created Oct. 1, 2009, by merging the Postal Clerk (PC) and Storekeeper (SK) ratings. PC and SK Navy Reservists (E-1 to E-5) will convert to the LS rating April 1, 2010. All PC personnel are required to wear the SK rating badge no later than Oct. 1, 2011.

**General Apprenticeship

Adapted from "Navy Personnel Command via All Hands 2010 Owners' and Operators' Manual." by NPC, 2010.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX J. NAVY ENLISTED MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION

The following chart shows the minimum requirements for Navy enlisted promotions in the pay grades of E-2 through E-4.

<u>Requirements</u>	<u>E-1 to E-2</u>	<u>E-2 to E-3</u>	<u>E-3 to E-4</u>
Time-in-Grade	9 months	9 months as E-2	6 months as E-3
School	Boot Camp	None	A-School (for ratings with A-schools)
BUPERS Approval to Participate	None		Required for Controlled Ratings
PARS	None		PARS Required
Performance Test	None		Selected ratings must complete applicable performance test before taking the Navy Service-Wide Advancement Exams.
Leadership Training	None		Petty Officer Indoctrination Course
Enlisted Performance Evaluation	Used by Commanding Officer when giving promotion approval.		Counts as performance factor in Advancement Final Multiple for all E-4 through E-7 candidates.
Obligated Service Requirements	There is no single set of obligated amount of service required to take Navy-wide advancement exams or to accept advancement to pay grade E-2 to E-6.		
Examinations	Locally Prepared Testing	NETPDTC Exams	Navy-Wide Advancement Exams are required for all Petty Officer Pay grades
Non-Resident Career Course and RTM	None	Required for all E-3 and Petty Officer advancements unless waived due to completion of Navy School. Courses need only be completed once.	
Recommended by Commanding Officer	All Navy Advancements Require the Commanding Officer's recommendation for advancement on current evaluation.		

Adapted from "US Military.About.com, para. 4." by US Military.About.com website 2010.

The following chart shows the minimum requirements for Navy enlisted promotions in the pay grades of E-5 through E-9.

<u>Requirements</u>	<u>E-4 to E-5</u>	<u>E-5 to E-6</u>	<u>E-6 to E-7</u>	<u>E-7 to E-8</u>	<u>E-8 to E-9</u>
Time-in-Grade	12 months as E-4	48 months as E-5	48 months as E-6	60 months as E-7	36 months as E-8
School	NJS for rating LN2	None	Navy School for ratings AGC, MUC, and RPC	None	None
BUPERS Approval to Participate			None		
PARS		PARS Required		None	
Performance Test		Selected ratings must complete applicable performance test before taking the Navy Service-Wide Advancement Exams.		None	
Leadership Training	P02 Leadership Training Course Continuum	P01 Leadership Training Course Continuum	CPO Indoctrination Course	CPO Leadership Training Course	None
Enlisted Performance Evaluation		Counts as performance factor in Advancement Final Multiple for all E-4 through E-7 candidates.		Considered by Promotion Board when making promotion decisions.	
Obligated Service Requirements		There is no single set of obligated amount of service required to take Navy-wide advancement exams or to accept advancement to pay grade E-2 to E-6.		Must remain on active duty a minimum of two years to retire at the higher pay grade.	
Examinations		Navy-Wide Advancement Exams are required for all Petty Officer Pay grades		Promotion to E-7 requires Navy-Wide Advancement Exam and selection by the Navy-Wide CPO Selection Board. Promotion to E-8 and E-9 is accomplished by Navy-Wide Promotion Selection Board, only.	
Non-Resident Career Course and RTM		Required for all E-3 and Petty Officer advancements unless waived due to completion of Navy School. Courses need only be completed once.		Non-Resident Career Courses and recommended readings (See NAVEDTRA 10052).	
Recommended by Commanding Officer			All Navy Advancements Require the Commanding Officer's recommendation for advancement on current evaluation.		

Adapted from "US Military.About.com, para. 5." by US Military.About.com website 2010.

APPENDIX K. FITNESS REPORT (FITREP)

FITNESS REPORT & COUNSELING RECORD (E7 - O6)

RCS BUPERS 1610-1

1. Name (Last, First MI Suffix)				2. Grade/Rate		3. Desig		4. SSN			
5. ACT <input type="checkbox"/> TAR <input type="checkbox"/> INACT <input type="checkbox"/> AT/ADS/W/265 <input type="checkbox"/>				6. UIC		7. Ship/Station			8. Promotion Status		
9. Date Reported											
Occasion for Report				Period of Report							
10. Periodic <input type="checkbox"/> Detachment <input type="checkbox"/> Detachment of <input type="checkbox"/> 11. of Individual <input type="checkbox"/> 12. Reporting Senior <input type="checkbox"/> 13. Special <input type="checkbox"/>				14. From:		15. To:					
16. Not Observed Report <input type="checkbox"/> 17. Regular <input type="checkbox"/> 18. Concurrent <input type="checkbox"/> 19. Ops Cdr <input type="checkbox"/>				20. Physical Readiness		21. Billet Subcategory (if any)					
22. Reporting Senior (Last, FI MI)				23. Grade		24. Desig		25. Title		26. UIC	
										27. SSN	
28. Command employment and command achievements.											
29. Primary/Collateral/Watchstanding duties. (Enter primary duty abbreviation in box.)											
For Mid-term Counseling Use. (When completing FITREP enter 30 and 31 from counseling worksheet sign 32.)				30. Date Counseled		31. Counselor			32. Signature of Individual Counseled		
PERFORMANCE TRAITS: 1.0 - Below standards/not progressing or UNSAT in any one standard; 2.0 - Does not yet meet all 3.0 standards; 3.0 - Meets all 3.0 standards; 4.0 - Exceeds most 3.0 standards; 5.0 - Meets overall criteria and most of the specific standards for 5.0. Standards are not all inclusive.											
PERFORMANCE TRAITS		1.0* Below Standards		2.0 Progressing		3.0 Meets Standards		4.0 Above Standards		5.0 Greatly Exceeds Standards	
33. PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE: Professional knowledge, proficiency, and qualifications.		- Lacks basic professional knowledge to perform effectively. - Cannot apply basic skills. - Fails to develop professionally or achieve timely qualifications.		- Has thorough professional knowledge. - Competently performs both routine and new tasks. - Steadily improves skills, achieves timely qualifications.		- Recognized expert, sought after to solve difficult problems. - Exceptionally skilled, develops and executes innovative ideas. - Achieves early/highly advanced qualifications.					
NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
34. COMMAND OR ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY: Contributing to growth and development, human worth, community.		- Actions counter to Navy's retention/recruitment goals. - Uninvolved with mentoring or professional development of subordinates. - Actions counter to good order and discipline and negatively affect Command/Organizational climate. - Demonstrates exclusionary behavior. Fails to value differences from cultural diversity.		- Positive leadership supports Navy's increased retention goals. Active in decreasing attrition. - Actions adequately encourage/support subordinates' personal/professional growth. - Demonstrates appreciation for contributions of Navy personnel. Positive influence on Command climate. - Values differences as strengths. Fosters atmosphere of acceptance/inclusion per EO/EEO policy.		- Measurably contributes to Navy's increased retention and reduced attrition objectives. - Proactive leader/exemplary mentor. Involved in subordinates' personal development leading to professional growth/sustained commitment. - Initiates support programs for military, civilian, and families to achieve exceptional Command and Organizational climate. - The model of achievement. Develops unit cohesion by valuing differences as strengths.					
NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
35. MILITARY BEARING/CHARACTER: Appearance, conduct, physical fitness, adherence to Navy Core Values.		- Consistently unsatisfactory appearance. - Unsatisfactory demeanor or conduct. - Unable to meet one or more physical readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.		- Excellent personal appearance. - Excellent demeanor or conduct. - Complies with physical readiness program. - Always lives up to Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.		- Exemplary personal appearance. - Exemplary representative of Navy. - A leader in physical readiness. - Exemplifies Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.					
NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
36. TEAMWORK: Contributions towards team building and team results.		- Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. - Does not take direction well.		- Reinforces others' efforts, meets personal commitments to team. - Understands team goals, employs good teamwork techniques. - Accepts and offers team direction.		- Team builder, inspires cooperation and progress. - Talented mentor, focuses goals and techniques for team. - The best at accepting and offering team direction.					
NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
37. MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT AND INITIATIVE: Taking initiative, planning/prioritizing, achieving mission.		- Lacks initiative. - Unable to plan or prioritize. - Does not maintain readiness. - Fails to get the job done.		- Takes initiative to meet goals. - Plans/prioritizes effectively. - Maintains high state of readiness. - Always gets the job done.		- Develops innovative ways to accomplish mission. - Plans/prioritizes with exceptional skill and foresight. - Maintains superior readiness, even with limited resources. - Gets jobs done earlier and far better than expected.					
NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	

NAVPERS 1610/2 (Rev. 03-02)

Adapted from "NAVPERS 1610/2 (Rev. 3-02)." by Naval Personnel Command website 2010.

FITNESS REPORT & COUNSELING RECORD (E7 - O6) (cont'd)

RCS BUPERS 1610-1

1. Name (Last, First MI Suffix)		2. Grade/Rate		3. Design		4. SSN	
PERFORMANCE TRAITS	1.0* Below Standards	2.0 Pro- gressing	3.0 Meets Standards		4.0 Above Standards	5.0 Greatly Exceeds Standards	
38. LEADERSHIP: Organizing, motivating and developing others to accomplish goals. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neglects growth/development or welfare of subordinates. - Fails to organize, creates problems for subordinates. - Does not set or achieve goals relevant to command mission and vision. - Lacks ability to cope with or tolerate stress. - Inadequate communicator. - Tolerates hazards or unsafe practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - - - - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effectively stimulates growth/development in subordinates. - Organizes successfully implementing process improvements and efficiencies. - Sets/achieves useful, realistic goals that support command mission. - Performs well in stressful situations. - Clear, timely communicator. - Ensures safety of personnel and equipment. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - - - - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inspiring motivator and trainer, subordinates reach highest level of growth and development. - Superb organizer, great foresight, develops process improvements and efficiencies. - Leadership achievements dramatically further command mission and vision. - Perseveres through the toughest challenges and inspires others. - Exceptional communicator. - Makes subordinates safety-conscious, maintains top safety record. - Constantly improves the personal and professional lives of others. 	
39. TACTICAL PERFORMANCE: (Warfare qualified officers only) Basic and tactical employment of weapons systems. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has difficulty attaining qualifications expected for rank and experience. - Has difficulty in ship(s), aircraft or weapons systems employment. - Below others in knowledge and employment. - Warfare skills in specialty are below standards compared to others of same rank and experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attains qualifications as required and expected. - Capably employs ship(s), aircraft, or weapons systems. Equal to others in warfare knowledge and employment. - Warfare skills in specialty equal to others of same rank and experience. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - - - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully qualified at appropriate level for rank and experience. - Innovatively employs ship(s), aircraft, or weapons systems. Well above others in warfare knowledge and employment. - Warfare skills in specialty exceed others of same rank and experience. 	
40. I recommend screening this individual for next career milestone(s) as follows: (maximum of two) Recommendations may be for competitive schools or duty assignments such as: LCPO, DEPT CPO, SEA, CMC, CWO, LDO, Dept Head, XO, OIC, CO, Major Command, War College, PG School.							
41. COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE. * All 1.0 marks, three 2.0 marks, and 2.0 marks in Block 34 must be specifically substantiated in comments. Comments must be verifiable. Font must be 10 or 12 pitch (10 to 12 point) only. Use upper and lower case.							
Promotion Recommendation	NOB	Significant Problems	Progressing	Promotable	Must Promote	Early Promote	44. Reporting Senior Address
42. INDIVIDUAL							
43. SUMMARY							
45. Signature of Reporting Senior				46. Signature of individual evaluated. "I have seen this report, been apprised of my performance, and understand my right to make a statement."			
Date:				I intend to submit a statement <input type="checkbox"/> do not intend to submit a statement <input type="checkbox"/>			
Member Trait Average:		Summary Group Average:		Date:			
47. Typed name, grade, command, UIC, and signature of Regular Reporting Senior on Concurrent Report							
Date:							

NAVPERS 1610/2 (Rev. 3-02)

CLEAR FORM

Adapted from "NAVPERS 1610/2 (Rev. 3-02)." by Naval Personnel Command website 2010.

APPENDIX L. E-7 THRU E-9 EVALUATION AND COUNSELING RECORD (CHIEFEVAL)

EVALUATION & COUNSELING RECORD (E7 – E9)

RCS BUPERS 1610-1

Save Form

Clear Form

1. Name (Last, First MI Suffix)				2. Grade/Rate		3. Desig		4. SSN	
5. ACT		5. FTS		5. INACT		5. AT/ADSW/265		6. UIC	
7. Ship/Station				8. Promotion Status		9. Date Reported			
Occasion for Report		11. Detachment of Individual		12. Detachment of Reporting Senior		13. Special		Period of Report	
10. Periodic		14. From:		15. To:		20. Physical Readiness		21. Billet Subcategory (if any)	
16. Not Observed Report		17. Regular		18. Concurrent		19. Ops Cdr		27. SSN	
22. Reporting Senior (Last, FI MI)		23. Grade		24. Desig		25. Title		26. UIC	
28. Command employment and command achievements									
29. Primary/Collateral/Watchstanding duties. (Enter Primary duty abbreviation in box.)									
For Mid-term Counseling Use. (When completing FITREP Enter 30 and 31 from counseling worksheet sign 32.)				30. Date Counseled		31. Counselor		32. Signature of Individual Counseled	
PERFORMANCE TRAITS: 1.0 – Below standards / not progressing or UNSAT in any one standard; 2.0 – Does not yet meet all 3.0 standards; 3.0 – Meets all 3.0 standards; 4.0 – Exceeds most 3.0 standards; 5.0 – Meets overall criteria and most of the specific standards for 5.0. Standards are not all inclusive.									
PERFORMANCE TRAITS		1.0* Below Standards		2.0 Pro-gressing		3.0 Meets Standards		4.0 Above Standards	
33. DECKPLATE LEADERSHIP: - Organizing, motivating and developing others to accomplish goals. - Engaging and visible presence establishes positive tone for command. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		- Neglects growth/development or welfare of Junior Officer and Enlisted Sailors. - Presence not felt on the deckplates. - Does not set or achieve goals relevant to command mission and vision. - Does not tailor leadership style to situation or individual. - Fails to organize, creates problems for subordinates. - Lacks ability to manage under stress.		<input type="checkbox"/>		- Effectively stimulates growth/development in Junior Officers and Enlisted Sailors. - Visible and engaged on the deckplate; sets positive tone. - Sets/achieves useful, realistic goals that support command mission. - Tailors leadership to situation to accomplish mission. - Organizes successfully, implementing process improvements and efficiencies. - Performs well in stressful situations.		<input type="checkbox"/>	
34. INSTITUTIONAL AND TECHNICAL EXPERTISE: - Institutional, policy and technical knowledge. - Practical application, procedural compliance. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		- Lacks basic Navy knowledge. - Unaware and unwilling to learn details of Navy programs and policies. - Lacks basic professional knowledge to perform effectively. - Cannot apply basic skills. - Tactical knowledge and skill in specialty are below standards compared to others of same rank and experience.		<input type="checkbox"/>		- Has thorough knowledge of Navy organization and structure. - Has thorough knowledge of Navy programs and policies. - Has detailed rating knowledge; resolves technical issues within rating. - Competently performs both routine and new tasks. - Tactical knowledge and skill in specialty equal to others of same rank and experience.		<input type="checkbox"/>	
35. PROFESSIONALISM: - Standard enforcement; taking initiative, planning/prioritizing/ solving challenges in Chief's Mess. - Continuous learning; Standards of appearance, conduct, physical fitness, qualifications. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		- Fails to uphold and enforce standards. - Does not effectively utilize the Chief's Mess to plan and solve challenges. - Improvement of peers, subordinates, and self not a priority. - Unable to meet one or more physical readiness standards. - Consistently unsatisfactory appearance or unsatisfactory demeanor or conduct. - Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team.		<input type="checkbox"/>		- Actively teaches, upholds and enforces standards with peers and subordinates. - Participates in command planning and problem solving through the Chief's Mess. - Committed to professional education/training for self and subordinates. - Complies with physical readiness program. - Excellent personal appearance and representative of the Navy. - Reinforces others' efforts, meets personal commitments to team.		<input type="checkbox"/>	
36. LOYALTY: - Loyalty to mission, seniors, peers and subordinates. - Dedication to Sailor success, Sailor advocacy. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		- Does not consistently demonstrate loyalty to mission, seniors, peers or subordinates. - Not concerned about Sailor success. - Allows command challenges to impact Sailor readiness.		<input type="checkbox"/>		- Loyal to mission, seniors, peers and subordinates; moral courage to raise issues and support the outcome. - Effective mentor, actions adequately encourage/support subordinates' personal/professional growth. - Routinely solves command challenges before they significantly impact Sailor readiness.		<input type="checkbox"/>	
		- Inspiring motivator and trainer. Junior Officers and Enlisted Sailors reach highest level of growth and development. - Always visible and engaged on the deckplate; energetically sets positive tone across CMD. - Leadership achievements dramatically further command mission and vision. - Seamlessly tailors leadership to each Sailor's strengths, weaknesses and goals to maximize mission effectiveness. - Superb organizer, great foresight, develops process improvements and efficiencies. - Perseveres through the toughest challenges and inspires others.		<input type="checkbox"/>					
		- Navy Expert, complete understanding of purpose, organization, and structure. - Detailed, current knowledge and strong advocate for all Navy programs and policies. - Recognized expert, sought after to solve difficult problems, executes innovative ideas. - Exceptionally skilled; complete accuracy and precision in all technical actions, duties and procedures. - Tactical knowledge and skill in command mission and function.		<input type="checkbox"/>					
		- Proactively teaches, upholds, and enforces standards throughout the command. - Actively leads command activities, solves command challenges, and drives mission accomplishment through the Chief's Mess. - Fosters an environment of improvement, education and professional development. - A leader in physical readiness. - Exemplary personal appearance and representative of the Navy. - Team builder, inspires cooperation and focus on mission accomplishment; leverages talents of all Sailors.		<input type="checkbox"/>					

NAVPERS 1616/27 (6-08)

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY-PRIVACY ACT SENSITIVE.

Adapted from "NAVPERS 1616/27 (6-08)." by Naval Personnel Command website 2010.

EVALUATION & COUNSELING RECORD (E7 – E9) (cont'd)

RCS BUPERS 1610-1

1. Name (Last, First MI Suffix)			2. Grade/Rate		3. Desig		4. SSN	
PERFORMANCE TRAITS	1.0* Below Standards	2.0 Pro- gressing	3.0 Meets Standards		4.0 Above Standards	5.0 Greatly Exceeds Standards		
37. CHARACTER: - Integrity, adherence to Navy Core Values. - Recognition of Diversity. - Contributes to growth, human worth and community. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	- Demonstrates exclusionary behavior, fails to value differences from cultural diversity. - Lacks personal integrity and does not take responsibility for actions or decisions. - Fails to live up to Navy Core Values: Honor, Courage and Commitment. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Diversity: values differences as strengths, fosters atmosphere of acceptance/inclusion per EO/EEO policy. - Trustworthy, ethical and honest. - Always lives up to Navy Core Values: Honor, Courage and Commitment. <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	- Seamlessly integrates diversity into all aspects of the command. - Model of achievement. Develops unit cohesion by valuing differences as strengths. - Leads with an uncompromising code of integrity. - Exemplifies Navy Core Values: Honor, Courage and Commitment. <input type="checkbox"/>		
38. ACTIVE COMMUNICATION: - Communication, questioning attitude, energized information flow. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	- Stifles information exchange, idea sharing and diversity of opinion. - Does not take advantage of the Chief's Mess to discuss, plan, or act on command issues. - Poor communicator; actions negatively impact mission goals and readiness. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Facilitates information exchange, idea sharing and diversity of opinion. - Uses Chief's Mess as an open forum to discuss, plan, and act on command issues. - Effectively communicates and listens to subordinates, peers, and seniors. <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	- Actively facilitates information exchange, idea sharing and diversity of opinion. - Actively uses Chief's Mess as an open forum to discuss, plan, and act on command issues. - Energizes communication flow up and down the chain of command. <input type="checkbox"/>		
39. SENSE OF HERITAGE: - Know and teach customs and traditions, understand naval history. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	- Lacks knowledge and understanding of naval customs and traditions. - Ignores naval traditions, customs, and practices when considering decisions, in training, or in daily leadership. - No grasp of naval history. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Good understanding of naval customs and traditions. - Integrates naval traditions, customs, and practices into decision making processes, training and daily leadership. - Occasionally uses naval history to demonstrate who we are as a service. <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	- Thorough understanding of naval customs and traditions. - Proactively integrates naval traditions, customs, and practices into decision making processes, training and daily leadership. - Consistently uses naval history to demonstrate who we are as a service. <input type="checkbox"/>		
40. I recommend screening this individual for next career milestone(s) as follows: (Maximum of two) Recommendations may be for competitive schools or duty assignments such as LCPO, DEPT CPO, SEA, CMC								
41. COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE. *All 1.0 marks, three 2.0 marks, and 2.0 marks in Block 37 must be specifically substantiated in comments. Comments must be verifiable. Font must be 10 or 12 pitch (10 to 12 point) only. Use upper and lower case.								
Promotion Recommendation	NOB	Significant Problems	Progressing	Promotable	Must Promote	Early Promote	44. Reporting Senior Address	
42. INDIVIDUAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
43. SUMMARY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
45. Signature of Reporting Senior					46. Signature of individual evaluated. "I have seen this report, been apprised of my performance, and understand my right to make a statement."			
Date: _____					I intend to submit a statement <input type="checkbox"/> do not intend to submit a statement <input type="checkbox"/>			
Member Trait Average: 0.00		Summary Group Average:			Date: _____			
47. Typed name, grade, command, UIC, and signature of Regular Reporting Senior on Concurrent Report								
Date: _____								

NAVPERS 1616/27 (6-08)

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY-PRIVACY ACT SENSITIVE.

Adapted from "NAVPERS 1616/27 (6-08)." by Naval Personnel Command website 2010.

APPENDIX M. NAVADMIN 176/08

TO NAVADMIN

NAVADMIN 176/08

SUBJ/NAVY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND COUNSELING SYSTEM POLICY/CREATION OF E7-E9 EVALUATION AND COUNSELING FORM//

REF/A/DOC/NAVPERS 1616/27//

REF/B/DOC/NAVPERS 1610/2// REF/C/DOC/BUPERSINST 1610.10A/20 SEP
05//

REF/D/DOC/OPNAVINST 6110.H/15 AUG 05// NARR/REF A IS NAVPERS
1616/27

(6-08), EVALUATION AND COUNSELING RECORD (E7-E9).

REF B IS NAVPERS 1610/2 (03-02), FITNESS REPORT AND COUNSELING
RECORD (E7-O6).

REF C IS BUPERSINST 1610.10A, NAVY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
SYSTEM.

REF D IS OPNAVINST 6110.1H, PHYSICAL READINESS PROGRAM.//

1. THIS NAVADMIN INTRODUCES REF A AS THE E7-E9 EVALUATION AND
COUNSELING RECORD (CHIEFEVAL), REPLACING THE CURRENT FITREP,
REF B, FOR CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS (E7-E9). THE CHIEFEVAL
INCORPORATES CHIEF PETTY OFFICER EXPECTATIONS AS
PERFORMANCE TRAITS, WHICH COMPLETES ALIGNMENT OF CHIEF PETTY
OFFICER EXPECTATIONS, SELECTION GUIDANCE, AND EVALUATIONS.

2. FUNCTIONALLY, THE CHIEFEVAL AND THE CURRENT FITREP DIFFER
ONLY IN BLOCKS 5 AND 33 THROUGH 39. ALL FITREP WRITING GUIDANCE
IN REF C APPLIES DIRECTLY TO THE CHIEFEVAL, WITH THE FOLLOWING
AMPLIFYING INSTRUCTIONS:

A. FITREP PERFORMANCE TRAIT COMMAND OR ORGANIZATIONAL
CLIMATE/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IS EVALUATED IN THE CHARACTER TRAIT
OF THE CHIEFEVAL. IT IS VITAL TO OUR SUCCESS THAT CHIEF PETTY
OFFICERS SEAMLESSLY INTEGRATE DIVERSITY INTO THE FABRIC OF
THEIR CHARACTER AND INTO THE COMMAND'S EVERY DAY ACTIVITIES.
A GRADE OF 2.0 IN CHARACTER MUST BE SPECIFICALLY SUBSTANTIATED
IN BLOCK 41. IF A 2.0 GRADE IN CHARACTER IS ASSIGNED, THE REPORT IS
CONSIDERED ADVERSE AND THE CHIEF PETTY OFFICER (E7-E9) IS NOT
ELIGIBLE FOR ADVANCEMENT, OR ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE A
RECOMMENDATION OF PROMOTABLE.

B. EVALUATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CNO'S RETENTION AND ATTRITION GOALS IS SPREAD ACROSS DECKPLATE LEADERSHIP, PROFESSIONALISM, LOYALTY AND CHARACTER.

C. FITREP PERFORMANCE TRAIT MILITARY BEARING IS EVALUATED IN THE CHIEFEVAL AS A COMPONENT OF THE PROFESSIONALISM TRAIT. THIS WILL INCLUDE SPECIFIC PHYSICAL FITNESS ASSESSMENT INFORMATION PER REF D GUIDELINES.

D. THE CRITERIA FOR AN ADVERSE CHIEFEVAL REMAINS THE SAME AS THE FITREP EXCEPT AS OUTLINED IN PARA 2.A ABOVE.

3. EFFECTIVE 1 JULY 2008, REF A AND THE OPERATORS QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE, CAN BE DOWNLOADED FROM THE BUPERS WEBSITE AT [HTTP://WWW.NPC.NAVY.MIL](http://www.npc.navy.mil) THE CHIEFEVAL WILL BE USED FOR THE FIRST TIME TO COINCIDE WITH THE REGULAR E7 AND E8 REPORTING PERIOD ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2008. FOR THIS EVALUATION PERIOD, THE 15 DAY MAILING PROCEDURE IS HEREBY EXTENDED 30 DAYS. SEPTEMBER 2008 E7-E9 EVALUATIONS MUST BE MAILED TO COMNAVPERSCOM NLT 31 OCTOBER 2008.

Adapted from, "NAVADMIN 176/08." by Navy Personnel Command website, 2008.

APPENDIX N. CHIEF PETTY OFFICER CREED

During the course of this day you have been caused to humbly accept challenge and face adversity. This you have accomplished with rare good grace. Pointless as some of these challenges may have seemed, there were valid, time-honored reasons behind each pointed barb. It was necessary to meet these hurdles with blind faith in the fellowship of Chief Petty Officers. The goal was to instill in you that trust is inherent with the donning of the uniform of a Chief.

It was our intent to impress upon you that challenge is good; a great and necessary reality which cannot mar you - which, in fact, strengthens you. In your future as a Chief Petty Officer, you will be forced to endure adversity far beyond that imposed upon you today. You must face each challenge and adversity with the same dignity and good grace you demonstrated today. By experience, by performance, and by testing, you have been this day advanced to Chief Petty Officer.

In the United States Navy - and only in the United States Navy - the rank of E7 carries with it unique responsibilities and privileges you are now bound to observe and expected to fulfill. Your entire way of life is now changed. More will be expected of you; more will be demanded of you. Not because you are a E7 but because you are now a Chief Petty Officer. You have not merely been promoted one paygrade, you have joined an exclusive fellowship and, as in all fellowships, you have a special responsibility to your comrades, even as they have a special responsibility to you.

This is why we in the United States Navy may maintain with pride our feelings of accomplishment once we have attained the position of Chief Petty Officer. Your new responsibilities and privileges do not appear in print. They have no official standing; they cannot be referred to by name, number, nor file. They have existed for over 100 years, Chiefs before you have freely accepted responsibility beyond the call of printed assignment. Their actions and their performance demanded the respect of their seniors as well as their juniors.

It is now required that you be the fountain of wisdom, the ambassador of good will, the authority in personal relations as well as in technical applications. "Ask the Chief" is a household phrase in and out of the Navy. You are now the Chief. The exalted position you have now achieved - and the word exalted is used advisedly - exists because of the attitude and performance of the Chiefs before you. It shall exist only as long as you and your fellow Chiefs maintain these standards. It was our intention that you never forget this day.

It was our intention to test you, to try you, and to accept you. Your performance has assured us that you will wear "the hat" with the same pride as your comrades in arms before you. We take a deep and sincere pleasure in clasping your hand, and accepting you as a Chief Petty officer in the United States Navy.

Adapted from "NavyChief.com, para. 5-10." by NavyChief.com website 2010.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX O. EVALUATION REPORT AND COUNSELING RECORD (E-1 THROUGH E-6) - NAVPERS 1616/26

EVALUATION REPORT & COUNSELING RECORD (E1 - E6)

RCS BUPERS1610.-1

1. Name (Last, First MI Suffix)				2. Rate		3. Desig		4. SSN	
5. ACT <input type="checkbox"/>	TAR <input type="checkbox"/>	INACT <input type="checkbox"/>	AT/ADSW/265 <input type="checkbox"/>	6. UIC	7. Ship/Station			8. Promotion Status	9. Date Reported
Occasion for Report 10. Periodic <input type="checkbox"/>				Detachment 11. of Individual <input type="checkbox"/>		Promotion/ 12. Frocking <input type="checkbox"/>		13. Special <input type="checkbox"/>	
Period of Report 14. From:				15. To:					
16. Not Observed Report <input type="checkbox"/>				Type of Report 17. Regular <input type="checkbox"/>		18. Concurrent <input type="checkbox"/>		20. Physical Readiness	
21. Billet Subcategory (if any)				22. Reporting Senior (Last, FI MI)		23. Grade		24. Desig	
25. Title				26. UIC		27. SSN			
28. Command employment and command achievements.									
29. Primary/Collateral/Watchstanding duties. (Enter primary duty abbreviation in box.) <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>									
For Mid-term Counseling Use. (When completing EVAL, enter 30 and 31 from counseling worksheet, and sign 32.)				30. Date Counseled		31. Counselor		32. Signature of Individual Counseled	
PERFORMANCE TRAITS: 1.0 - Below standards/not progressing or UNSAT in any one standard; 2.0 - Does not yet meet all 3.0 standards; 3.0 - Meets all 3.0 standards; 4.0 - Exceeds most 3.0 standards; 5.0 - Meets overall criteria and most of the specific standards for 5.0. Standards are not all inclusive.									
PERFORMANCE TRAITS	1.0* Below Standards	2.0 Pro- gressing	3.0 Meets Standards	4.0 Above Standards	5.0 Greatly Exceeds Standards				
33. PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: Technical knowledge and practical application. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	- Marginal knowledge of rating, specialty or job. - Unable to apply knowledge to solve routine problems. - Fails to meet advancement/PQS requirements.	-	- Strong working knowledge of rating, specialty and job. - Reliably applies knowledge to accomplish tasks. - Meets advancement/PQS requirements on time.	-	- Recognized expert, sought out by all for technical knowledge. - Uses knowledge to solve complex technical problems. - Meets advancement/PQS requirements early/with distinction.				
34. QUALITY OF WORK: Standard of work; value of end product. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	- Needs excessive supervision. - Product frequently needs rework. - Wasteful of resources.	-	- Needs little supervision. - Produces quality work. Few errors and resulting rework. - Uses resources efficiently.	-	- Needs no supervision. - Always produces exceptional work. No rework required. - Maximizes resources.				
35. COMMAND OR ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY: Contributing to growth and development, human worth, community. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	- Actions counter to Navy's retention/recruitment goals. - Uninvolved with mentoring or professional development of subordinates. - Actions counter to good order and discipline and negatively affect Command/Organizational climate. - Demonstrates exclusionary behavior. Fails to value differences from cultural diversity.	-	- Positive leadership supports Navy's increased retention goals. Active in decreasing attrition. - Actions adequately encourage/support subordinates' personal/professional growth. - Demonstrates appreciation for contributions of Navy personnel. Positive influence on Command climate. - Values differences as strengths. Fosters atmosphere of acceptance/inclusion per EO/EEO policy.	-	- Measurably contributes to Navy's increased retention and reduced attrition objectives. - Proactive leader/exemplary mentor. Involved in subordinates' personal development leading to professional growth/sustained commitment. - Initiates support programs for military, civilian, and families to achieve exceptional Command and Organizational climate. - The model of achievement. Develops unit cohesion by valuing differences as strengths.				
36. MILITARY BEARING/ CHARACTER: Appearance, conduct, physical fitness, adherence to Navy Core Values. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	- Consistently unsatisfactory appearance. - Poor self-control; conduct resulting in disciplinary action. - Unable to meet one or more physical readiness standards. - Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.	-	- Excellent personal appearance. - Excellent conduct, conscientiously complies with regulations. - Complies with physical readiness program. - Always lives up to Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.	-	- Exemplary personal appearance. - Model of conduct, on and off duty. - A leader in physical readiness. - Exemplifies Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.				
37. PERSONAL JOB ACCOMPLISHMENT/ INITIATIVE: Responsibility, quantity of work. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>	- Needs prodding to attain qualification or finish job. - Prioritizes poorly. - Avoids responsibility.	-	- Productive and motivated. Completes tasks and qualifications fully and on time. - Plans/prioritizes effectively. - Reliable, dependable, willingly accepts responsibility.	-	- Energetic self-starter. Completes tasks or qualifications early, far better than expected. - Plans/prioritizes wisely and with exceptional foresight. - Seeks extra responsibility and takes on the hardest jobs.				

NAVPERS 1616/26 (Rev. 3-02)

Adapted from "NAVPERS 1616/26 (Rev. 3-02)." by Naval Personnel Command website 2010.

EVALUATION REPORT & COUNSELING RECORD (E1 - E6) (cont'd) RCS BUPERS 1616.2

1. Name (Last, First MI Suffix)				2. Rate		3. Desig		4. SSN	
PERFORMANCE TRAITS		1.0* Below Standards		2.0 Pro- gressing		3.0 Meets Standards		4.0 Above Standards	
								5.0 Greatly Exceeds Standards	
38. TEAMWORK: Contributions to team building and team results. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		- Creates conflict, unwilling to work with others, puts self above team. - Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. - Does not take direction well.		- - -		- Reinforces others' efforts, meets commitments to team. - Understands goals, employs good teamwork techniques. - Accepts and offers team direction.		- - - - Team builder, inspires cooperation and progress. - Focuses goals and techniques for teams. - The best at accepting and offering team direction.	
39. LEADERSHIP: Organizing, motivating and developing others to accomplish goals. NOB <input type="checkbox"/>		- Neglects growth/development or welfare of subordinates. - Fails to organize, creates problems for subordinates. - Does not set or achieve goals relevant to command mission and vision. - Lacks ability to cope with or tolerate stress. - Inadequate communicator. - Tolerates hazards or unsafe practices.		- - - - - - -		- Effectively stimulates growth/development in subordinates. - Organizes successfully, implementing process improvements and efficiencies. - Sets/achieves useful, realistic goals that support command mission. - Performs well in stressful situations. - Clear, timely communicator. - Ensures safety of personnel and equipment.		- - - - - - - - Inspiring motivator and trainer, subordinates reach highest level of growth and development. - Superb organizer, great foresight, develops process improvements and efficiencies. - Leadership achievements dramatically further command mission and vision. - Perseveres through the toughest challenges and inspires others. - Exceptional communicator. - Makes subordinates safety-conscious, maintains top safety record. - Constantly improves the personal and professional lives of others.	
40. Individual Trait Avg. Total of trait scores divided by number of graded traits. <input type="text"/>		41. I recommend this individual for (maximum of two): Assignment in Rating, Sea Special Programs, Shore Special Programs, Commissioning Programs, Special Warfare Programs, Rating Instructor Duty, Other. (Be specific.) <input type="text"/>				42. Signature of Rater (Typed Name & Rate): I have evaluated this member against the above performance standards and have forwarded written explanation of marks of 1.0 and 5.0. <div style="text-align: right;">Date: <input type="text"/></div>			
43. COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE. *All 1.0 marks, three 2.0 marks, and 2.0 marks in Block 35 must be specifically substantiated in comments. Comments must be verifiable. Font must be 10 or 12 pitch (10 to 12 point) only. Use upper and lower case.									
44. QUALIFICATIONS/ACHIEVEMENTS - Education, awards, community involvement, etc., during this period.									
Promotion Recommendation		NOB	Significant Problems	Progressing	Promotable	Must Promote	Early Promote	47. Retention: Not Recommended <input type="checkbox"/> Recommended <input type="checkbox"/>	
45. INDIVIDUAL								48. Reporting Senior Address	
46. SUMMARY									
49. Signature of Senior Rater (Typed Name & Grade/Rate): I have reviewed the evaluation of this member against these performance standards and have provided written explanation to support marks of 1.0 and 5.0. <div style="text-align: right;">Date: <input type="text"/></div>						50. Signature of Reporting Senior <div style="text-align: right;">Date: <input type="text"/></div>			
51. Signature of Individual Evaluated. "I have seen this report, been apprised of my performance, and understand my right to submit a statement." I intend to submit a statement. <input type="checkbox"/> I do not intend to submit a statement. <input type="checkbox"/> <div style="text-align: right;">Date: <input type="text"/></div>						52. Typed name, grade, command, UIC, and signature of Regular Reporting Senior on Concurrent Report <div style="text-align: right;">Date: <input type="text"/></div>			

NAVPERS 1616/26 (Rev. 3-02)

2

CLEAR FORM

Adapted from "NAVPERS 1616/26 (Rev. 3-02)." by Naval Personnel Command website 2010.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abrashoff, D., Michael (CAPT). (2002). *It's your ship: Management techniques from the best damn ship in the Navy*. New York: Warner Books, Inc.
- All Hands*. 2010 owners and operators manual. Retrieved on February 17, 2010, from <http://www.navy.mil/media/allhands/acrobat/ah201001.pdf>
- All Hands: A Supplement to All Hands Magazine*. 2010 Calendar.
- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*, Sixth Edition. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Blanchard, Ken and Shula, Don. (1995). *Everyone's a coach: Five business secrets for high-performance coaching*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Booth, Wayne, C., Colomb, Gregory, G., and Williams, Joseph, M. (2008). *The craft of research*, Third Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Burlage, John. (2001, July 9). Great expectations: the Navy is raising the bar on enlisted khaki duties and standards. *Navy Times*, pp. 16.
- Campbell, Jane (Commander) & Simmons, D., Keith (Mass Communication Specialist Second Class - MC2). (2009, November 23). Lax leadership led to Hartford accident. *Navy Times*, pp. 22.
- Center for Personal and Professional Development. Retrieved on February 25, 2010, from <https://www.netc.navy.mil/centers/cppd/>
- Chief of Naval Operations. (2008, February 13). OPNAV Instruction 1306.2E: Command Master Chief Program.
- Chief of Naval Operations. (2008, September 26). Enlisted Navy Leadership Development (NAVADMIN 272/08). Retrieved on March 20, 2010, from <http://www.cffc.navy.mil/fltcm-news/messages/NAVADMIN%20272-08-ENLISTED NAVY LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT.txt>
- Chief of Naval Operations. (2006, January 19). Navy Leadership Continuum (NAVADMIN 033/06), pp. 1-3.
- Chief of Naval Personnel. (2009). Letter to the president of the FY-10 active duty Navy chief petty officer selection board. Retrieved on March 10, 2010, from <http://www.bupers.navy.mil>

- Chief Petty Officer Guiding Principles. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from <http://www.goatlocker.org/resources/cpomvgp.jpg>
- Chief Petty Officer Indoctrination. (2001, July 30). History and traditions of the chief petty officer (Topic 1). Retrieved on March 12, 2010, from <http://www.goatlocker.org/resources/cpo/about/cpoic.pdf>
- Collins, Jim. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher.
- Crist, Charlotte, D. (1992). *Winds of change: The history of the office of the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy: 1967–1992*. Washington, DC: Office of the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy and the Naval Historical Center.
- Cutler, Thomas, J. (2002). *The bluejacket's manual: United States Navy centennial edition*. Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press.
- Department of the Navy (Chief of Naval Personnel). (2009, June 18). Precept Convening FY–10 Selection Board to Consider First Class Petty Officers of the Navy and Navy Reserve, Serving on Active-Duty for Advancement to Chief Petty Officer.
- Drewry, Douglas, L. (2007). *The chief petty officer's manual*, third edition. Pensacola, FL: Professional Management Spectrum, Inc.
- Ehrenberg, Ronald, G. and Smith, Robert, S. (2009). *Modern labor economics: theory and public policy*, tenth edition. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Eyer, Kevin, S (Captain, ret.). (2010, January). Reviving the chiefs' mess. *Proceedings*. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/story.asp?STORY_ID=2170
- Faram, Mark, D. (2009, December 21). MCPON: chiefs must shape up. *Navy Times*, pp. 20.
- Faram, Mark, D. (2009, November 23). Replacements sought for separated chiefs. *Navy Times*, pp. 18.
- Faram, Mark, D. (2009, November 16). What West wants in 2010. *Navy Times*, pp. 16.
- Faram, Mark, D. (2007, July 30). MCPON's next moves – Campa sets sights on leadership training, fitness, uniforms and the Chiefs' Mess. *Navy Times*, pp. 14.
- Faram, Mark, D. (2007, September 10). Coast Guard adopts Campa's CPO principles. *Navy Times*, pp. 12.
- Faram, Mark, D. (2004, February 9). Enlisted leadership training gets another makeover – fewer classes, more independent study for sailors. *Navy Times*, pp. 22.

- Faram, Mark, D and Fuentes, Gidget. Chiefs should be leaders – Mullen wants senior enlisted to take charge of the fleet. *Navy Times*, pp. 14.
- Fuentes, Gidget. (2009, November 16). Report: E-9 neglected duties. *Navy Times*, pp. 24.
- Goat Locker. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from <http://www.goatlocker.org/>
- Heffernan, Margaret. (2008, July 8). Managing generational differences in the workplace. *Fast Company*. Retrieved on March 22, 2010, from <http://www.fastcompany.com/resources/talent/heffernan/managing-generational-differences/052507.html>
- Houlihan, Bill (Senior Chief Mass Communication Specialist – MCCS). (2008, June 30). New CPO evaluation takes effect this September. *Navy.mil*, pp. 1–2.
- Jansing, Tom. History of the chief petty officer rate. Retrieved on January 20, 2010, from <http://www.uscg.mil/petaluma/CPOA/History/jansing.asp>
- Kelso, Frank, B., II (ADM). Naval History and Heritage Command. One hundred years of leadership. Retrieved on November 17, 2009, from <http://www.history.navy.mil/faqs/faq46-3.htm>
- Kozloski, Robert, P (Captain, U.S. Marine Corps). (2003, October). Unplug the computers & power up the petty officers. *Proceedings*, pp. 108.
- Lambert, Mike (Captain, ret.). (2007 April). Anchor up, chiefs! Reset the Mess. *Proceedings*, pp. 71–73.
- Leahy, J., F. (2004). *Ask the chief: backbone of the Navy*. Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press.
- Linton, Lawrence II (Master Chief Yeoman – YNCM). (2009, December 14). Chiefs are leaders, experts. *Navy Times* (Letters), pp. 4.
- Malin, Charles, A. Naval History and Heritage Command. Ratings and the evolution of jobs in the Navy. Retrieved on February 25, 2010, from <http://www.history.navy.mil/faqs/faq78-1.htm>
- Malis, Mark, D. (2009). *Gap odyssey*. Bloomington, Indiana: Author House.
- NavyChief.com. Retrieved on March 15, 2010, from http://www.navychief.com/Merchant2/merchant.mvc?Store_Code=N&Screen=CTGY&Category_Code=CPO-CREED
- Navy Department. (1893, February 25). General Order 409. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from <http://www.goatlocker.org/resources/409.pdf>

- Navy Knowledge Online. Retrieved on March 10, 2010, from <https://wwwa.nko.navy.mil/portal/home/>
- Navy.mil. U.S. Navy officer ranks and enlisted rates. Retrieved on February 23, 2010, from <http://www.navy.mil/navydata/ranks/rankrate.html>
- Navy Personnel Command. Manual of Navy enlisted manpower and personnel classifications and occupations standards, Volume 1. Navy enlisted occupational standards (NAVPERS 18068F). (2010, January). Appendix B occupational fields and associated ratings.
- Navy Personnel Command. Manual of Navy enlisted manpower and personnel classifications and occupational standards, Volume II. Navy enlisted classifications (NECs) (NAVPERS 18068F). (2010 January). Chapter III, Navy ratings and entry series NECS.
- Navy Personnel Command. MILPERSMAN 1221-010, Enlisted occupational classification structure. (2002, August 22).
- Navy Personnel Command. MILPERSMAN 1221-030, Purpose and scope of Navy personnel classification system. (2008, October 17). Chapter 25.
- Navy Personnel Command. MILPERSMAN 1223-010, Enlisted pay grades and titles. (2008, July 18). Chapter 24.
- Navy Personnel Command Public Affairs. (2009, April 1). CNP provides update for senior enlisted continuation boards. Navy.mil, pp. 1.
- Nelson, Monica, R (Mass Communication Specialist First Class – MC1). (2009, November 6). MCPON Fleet and Force Master Chief leadership conference stresses deck-plate concerns. Navy.mil. Retrieved on March 17, 2010, from http://www.navy.mil/search/display.asp?story_id=49497
- Non-commissioned Officer History. Retrieved on January 12, 2010, from <http://www.ncohistory.com/articles/mpb1958.htm>
- Phillips, Donald, T. (1992). *Lincoln on leadership*. New York: Hachette Book Group, Inc.
- Pierce, Clark. (2009, November 18). MCPON calls Fleet and Force Leadership conference. *Jax Air News*. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from http://www.navy.mil/search/display.asp?story_id=49545
- Portuesi, Anthony. (2009, March 31). Gen Y in the workplace. *Sparxoo*. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from <http://sparxoo.com/2009/03/31/gen-y-in-the-workplace>

- Russell, James, P. (2000, February). Chiefs are still the lynchpins. *Proceedings*, pp. 36–38.
- Sacks, Danielle. (2007, December 19). Scenes from the culture clash. *Fast Company*. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from <http://www.fastcompany.com/magazine/102/culture-clash.html>
- Senior Enlisted Academy. Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from <http://www.usnwc.edu/Students/Senior-Enlisted-Academy.aspx>
- Smelser, Marshall. (1958). The passage of the Naval Act of 1794. *Military Affairs*, Vol. 22, No.1, pp. 1–12. Retrieved on February 2, 2010, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1985480>
- Smith, Russell (CMDCM). (2009). FY-10 chief petty officer selection board power point.
- Smola, Karen, Wey and Sutton, Charlotte, D. (2002, June) Generational differences: revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, No.4, pp. 363–382. Retrieved on March 22, 2010, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4093812>
- Snell, John. (1998, February). Leave a legacy. *Proceedings*, pp. 36–37.
- Stephens, Andy. (1958, May 20). Making the supergrade. *Air Force Print News Today*, pp. 1.
- Stephens, Douglas, E. (2006, April). Talent-based leadership in military healthcare. *Proceedings*, pp. 72–73.
- Total Active Federal Military Service. Retrieved on January 28, 2010, from http://www.tpub.com/content/administration/14213/css/14213_55.htm
- Trunk, Penelope. (2007, July 5). What Gen Y really wants. *Time*. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1640395,00.html>
- Tucker, Lester, B. (CWO-4, Retired). Naval History and Heritage Command. History of the chief petty officer grade. Retrieved on March 3, 2010, from <http://www.history.navy.mil/faqs/faq46-1.htm>
- Useem, Michael. (2001). *Leading up: How to lead your boss so you both win*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- U.S. Military.About.com. Retrieved on January 5, 2010, from <http://usmilitary.about.com/od/navy/l/blpromchart.htm>
- Wagner, Scott (Senior Chief Electronics Technician). (2009, November 30). Chiefs failed the test. *Navy Times* (Letters), pp. 4.

- Walsh, Patrick, M (Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Navy). (1989, April). Lighting lamps, not stars. *Proceedings*, pp. 92–93.
- Webster. (1995) *The new American Webster handy college dictionary*, third edition. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Wikipedia. Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy. Retrieved on January 20, 2010, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Master_Chief_Petty_Officer_of_the_Navy
- Wulforth, Ellen. (2009, June 25). Generation Y makes waves in workplace. *Reuters*. Retrieved on March 21, 2010, from <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE55O3AQ20090625>
- Yager, Maria (Chief Mass Communication Specialist – MCC). (2009, October 30). Navy retains more than 97 percent from senior enlisted continuation board. Navy.mil, pp. 1–2.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Naval Postgraduate School
Academic Associate, Manpower Systems Analysis
Monterey, California
4. Dr. Neal Thornberry, GB, Innovation Chair
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
5. Professor Alice Crawford, GB, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California